Musical Ministries in the Church

WALDO SELDEN PRATT



G.M. Elliott Library
Cincinnati [illegible] University
[illegible]
Cincinnati, OH 45204-3200

G.M. Elliott Library
Cincinnati Christian University
2700 Glenway Ave
Cincinnati, OH 45204-3200

HELP KEEP THE LIBRARY IN ORDER

BY OBSERVING THE FOLLOWING
RULES AND REGULATIONS

When removing a book from the Library, sign your *name* on the card in the pocket at the back of the book. Initials are not sufficient. Write *date* of removal plainly beside name, and leave the card at the Librarian's desk.

Books may be kept out two weeks, except those marked "7-day" books.

A *Fine* of 2c a day will be charged to those keeping books over the allotted time.

Never return a book to the shelves. Always bring it to the Librarian's desk.

When taking a *Reserve Book* from the shelves to a table, sign your name and the date on the card at the back, and leave the card with the Librarian. Return the book *to the desk*, not to the shelves.

Reserve Books may *not* be removed from the Library except at night between 9:30 P.M. and 8:30 A.M. by special *permission* from the Librarian. Fine for so doing will be from 25c a day up.

MUSICAL MINISTRIES IN THE CHURCH

Musical Ministries in the Church

Studies in the History, Theory and Administration of Sacred Music

BY

Waldo Selden Pratt, Mus. D.

Professor of Music and Hymnology in Hartford Theological Seminary

49198

NEW YORK CHICAGO TORONTO

Fleming H. Revell Company

1901

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Christian University

264.2
P889
1901

COPYRIGHT 1901
BY
FLEMING H. REVELL COMPANY
(July)

DENISON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY
GRANVILLE OHIO

INTRODUCTORY NOTE

THE matter in the following pages was originally brought together as a short series of lectures before the faculty and students of McCormick (Presbyterian) Theological Seminary in Chicago in the spring of 1900. The selection of topics, their arrangement, and the form of presentation were all determined by the particular use then in view. They were lectures to ministerial candidates rather than to musicians, and were therefore intended to treat of principles of thought and action rather than of musical technicalities.

In preparing them for publication it has seemed best to adhere closely to the original plan and even to retain in many cases the direct manner of address, but they have been rewritten throughout and considerably expanded at certain points. One or two appendices have also been added, furnishing information about books upon church music in general or upon hymns and hymn-writers for which inquiry is often made.

Introductory Note

This volume, then, makes no pretension to be an elaborate or comprehensive treatise. It is rather a series of popular studies on selected aspects of a great and fertile subject, growing out of the experience of a church musician and a teacher in a theological seminary for many years, which are now set forth simply in the hope that the lines of thought that have proved of some interest to those who have been met as students may be not without suggestiveness to a wider circle in the ministry and among church musicians generally.

CONTENTS

PAGE

RELIGION AND THE ART OF MUSIC . 9

HYMNS AND HYMN-SINGING . . . 45

THE CHOIR 83

THE ORGAN AND THE ORGANIST . . 122

THE MINISTER'S RESPONSIBILITY . . 146

APPENDICES:—

I. Books on Church Music in General . 165

II. Books on Hymns and Hymn-Writers 170

III. American Church Hymnals, Published since 1880 174

INDEX 177

RELIGION *and the* ART OF MUSIC

THE word "religion" is constantly used in two senses that sometimes need to be somewhat carefully distinguished. On the one hand, it denotes certain inner states of the heart toward God and toward godliness. In this usage it is applied to the description of beliefs, moral sentiments, and such purely spiritual qualities as make up personal experience and character. On the other hand, it also denotes certain bodies of formulated statements and practices in which such inner religious life comes to social manifestation, including many details of embodied thought or concrete action that are so distinct from a genuine soul-experience that they may sometimes be unwittingly substituted for it or thrown into a kind of opposition to it. The one sense of the word is subjective, the other objective. The one belongs to the sphere of private individuality, the other to that of social institutions. However much harm may result from using this distinction as a means of evading practical spiritual obligations, it is still necessary and valuable for clear thinking. Religion

as a social phenomenon is largely characterized by outward institutions, such as the organizations of church polity, the fixed elaborations of church doctrine, and the established customs of church worship, all of which readily offer themselves to ordinary historical and scientific scrutiny. These things are in themselves external to the essence of religion, and yet in many cases are almost the only available data for the study of religion. So far as they go, they are surely valuable as indications of the more intimate and intangible sides of religion, and as obviously powerful agencies in determining and perpetuating religious experience.

When one takes up the question of the relations of the art of music to religion, it is natural to think first of its evident historic connection with certain aspects of religion as a social manifestation, especially with the great religious institution of public worship. This connection has been so constant and so close that it immediately challenges attention. Music actually seems to be necessary to public worship. At least, its prevalence in all kinds of public worship, with but insignificant exceptions (as among

the Quakers), suggests that it has an altogether peculiar aptness for incorporation into the observances that constitute this, the most conspicuous of the social embodiments of religion.

In illustration of this point it is not necessary to traverse the items in the prodigious catalogue of the various applications of music in public worship in every century and land. The main outline of the list is entirely familiar—from the Hebrew Temple with its choir and its Psalms, and from the synagogue and the early Christian fraternities, with their cantillation and choral antiphony, through the slowly-formed rituals of both the Eastern and the Western Churches, with their sonorous and sumptuous services, and through the much simpler usages of all the different Reformed Churches, with their return in some way to true congregational praise, even to the manifold customs of modern Christendom, with the curious blending in its several denominations of musical habits derived most variously through distinct lines of tradition. Everywhere and always public worship has chosen to make utterance freely through poetry meant for singing, and to count mu-

sic, usually both vocal and instrumental, as a cherished and indispensable part of its liturgical apparatus. Single items in this list often seem at first sight to stand far apart and even in opposition; yet close study shows that all are bound together by remarkable bonds of historic continuity and essential relationship. The union of religion with music, therefore, can be illustrated by instances drawn from every quarter of the civilized world and from every age throughout not less than three millenniums. This general fact is well known, and something of its massive magnitude is perhaps duly appreciated.

We must remember, however, that emphasis upon this fact is often suspected of being prompted by a kind of mere sentimentality or of being called forth by the casuistry of the special pleader. In these days of highly complex culture and of the infinite subdivision of intellectual interests that they may be separately pursued, the great art of music has become so specialized and so elaborate in itself as to claim full independence as a social fact. Music now has its own literature and periodicals, its own established commercial enterprises, its

own professional class, its own systems of education, its own vast circle of devotees and students, its own artistic laws and doctrines, its own organic momentum as an independent fine art, at least coördinate with the other historic fine arts. Religion, it may be said, is another such independent social phenomenon. Music and religion, it may be urged, have nothing important to do with each other, except, of course, in the one particular that religious worship does more or less utilize musical implements and skill in a comparatively petty way for its own purposes. The connection between the two subjects may thus be minimized until it seems to be only incidental and accidental. The captious critic may exclaim, "Music has always been used in war, and with notable results; and are we therefore to lecture learnedly on War and Music as if they were somehow akin?" Or possibly he turns the matter about by saying, "Public worship is singularly dependent for success on certain aspects of practical building, like acoustics or ventilation; and are we therefore soberly to discuss Religion and Acoustics or Religion and Ventilation as necessary to each other?" In view of possible

scoffs like these it may be well to recall one or two considerations that go to show that the relation now before us is not so loose or casual as either some musical enthusiasts or some religious workers would have us imagine.

It is worth remembering, in the first place, that the art of music is what it is today largely in consequence of what religion has done for it. By this I mean that the demands that religion has put upon music, the opportunities and incentives for its development that religion has afforded, and the basis of knowledge and character that religion has supplied for musical culture—I mean that these have furnished to music the necessary occasion and atmosphere and nutriment for its growth to the stature of a great and famous fine art. Music is to a striking degree the creation or child of the Church. Many of its most ordinary technical ways and resources were discovered or invented primarily because the Church needed them. Hundreds of its most constructive masters were trained primarily as ecclesiastical officers, so that sometimes for ages together the entire direction of its ar-

tistic progress has been given by those whose minds were full of religious ideas and whose work was actuated by religious motives. The stages of advance leading up to our modern musical styles were many of them strictly ecclesiastical undertakings, called forth by religion, intended to dignify religion, and more or less potent in fostering and conserving religion.

This point will bear illustration, though necessitating reference to a few musical technicalities. It is well known that all orderly musical procedure in composition rests upon three constructive doctrines: Harmony, dealing with chords and tonality, Counterpoint, dealing with voice-parts and their interweaving, and Form, including every grade of the rhythmical disposition of tone-materials. Harmony and Counterpoint are distinguishable, though vitally interdependent. In our modern theories we usually put Harmony first, but historically Counterpoint was developed first. The altogether extraordinary elaboration of Counterpoint in the later Middle Ages was the first systematic effort to deliver music from its ancient bondage to mere poetical recitation, and to give it laws of internal struc-

ture and organization somewhat analogous to those of architecture. For some three centuries—say from about 1200 to after 1500—almost the entire energy of those who made music a real study was put upon the solution of this problem, whose difficulty is but slightly appreciated by those who have not themselves wrestled with it. The result was the formulation of certain laws of musical grammar and rhetoric that have never since been abrogated, though their applications have been extended and multiplied. Every composer to-day must follow the lines of procedure once for all established rudimentally by tedious experiment and toil some five hundred years ago.

Now, the important fact for us here is that every step in this process was taken by ecclesiastics and primarily for the upbuilding of church music. Nowhere but in the Church was there an adequate opening or a sufficient motive. The Gregorian style, out of which Counterpoint grew, was itself a style peculiar to the Church. The few pioneers in the tenth, eleventh and twelfth centuries whose names we know were all monks. The earliest piece of Counterpoint that is now extant, whose date is conjec-

tured to be about 1226, appears to have been written in an English abbey. Of the recognized masters in the gradual unfolding of the contrapuntal system, observe that Dufay (died 1474) was a priest, Okeghem (died 1495) a canon, Josquin des Prés (died 1521) at least a duly appointed choirmaster and organist, and remember further that the culmination of the whole contrapuntal movement in the sixteenth century was dominated either by the splendid series of church musicians connected with St. Mark's, in Venice, or by Lassus (died 1594), the life-long *protégé* of the devout Duke of Bavaria, or by Palestrina (died 1594), whose whole career was spent in active church service, most of it in the Papal Chapel. Apparently, then, we may safely say that this exceedingly rich expansion of music from insignificance into an artistic system whose possibilities in this special direction of contrapuntal structure are still by no means exhausted, would have been inconceivable at this period and perhaps for centuries after, if it had not been for the stimulus of religion and the cordial support of the Church.

But even before the end of the fifteenth

century, and still more as the sixteenth progressed, it became clear that purely contrapuntal advance, strong and remarkable as it was, came up against limitations and disclosed inherent imperfections. The whole truth regarding musical composition could not be seen from the merely contrapuntal point of view. The Gregorian system had brought over to the Middle Ages from ancient times a theory of scales that was defective, and strict Counterpoint had failed to solve the fundamental problem of Form. The necessary supplement was furnished rapidly throughout the sixteenth century by grafting into sacred music certain new features that seem to have been chiefly derived from earlier secular music of what was then esteemed a much humbler sort, from the songs of the Troubadours of France and the Minnesinger of Germany and their successors and from the folk-dances of the peasantry.

The origin of these new elements cannot be claimed for the Church, and their first motives were not distinctly religious. But one or two of the main channels through which they were now poured into the stream of general musical tendency were

distinctly religious. It will be enough for our purpose to dwell upon but one of these —the famous hymn-singing of the Reformation. This was organized first by Luther and later by Calvin and diligently cultivated by their followers for purely liturgical and evangelistic purposes. It was carried forward into practical effect by musical enthusiasts, and it spread far and wide because it appealed to universal musical tastes. In consequence, to an extent that is but poorly appreciated by musical historians, the clear instinct or intuition of the common people as to musical methods was made to assume control of professional or scholastic composition. As we pass over into the seventeenth century, we find that the whole theory of music has undergone a revolution, true Harmony and true Form now for the first time taking their places with Counterpoint as structural determinants of the art. Both of these constructive elements were strongly developed in the rapidly multiplying chorales of Germany and Switzerland and Scotland. Wherever the Reformation spread, the practice of constant hymn-singing went, and wherever hymn-singing appeared, the whole course of musical progress

was directed, as never before, into usages in which Counterpoint was fully supplemented by its necessary companion elements. It would be foolish to claim that this great transition would not have occurred without the aid of Protestant congregational singing, but it is equally foolish to belittle the part that that singing played in hastening and diffusing the ideas that distinguished modern music from mediæval at the outset of its career.

Contemporaneous with these movements and involved in them was another of almost equal importance. The organ, though apparently of Greek origin in the time of Alexandria's eminence as a center of culture, had early been appropriated by the Christian Church as its peculiar musical instrument. During the next millennium the use of the organ seems to have been confined to the barest support of plain-song, and its construction remained very simple. But as Counterpoint developed, the structure of the organ necessarily became more complicated and the technique of its players more skillful. About 1500 we find that the arrangement of the keyboard had become nearly what we now have, and many other

important details of construction had been greatly improved. The art of organ-building had become so mature and lucrative that we now find it for the first time escaping from the monasteries and becoming here and there a secular trade. As the instrument improved, its players began to reach out more or less eagerly after music suitable for it alone, independent of singing. To write music of this purely instrumental sort began to be an ambition with leading composers—a wholly new ambition in the field of scholastic music.

Without stopping for details, we may simply remind ourselves of the obvious influence of this upon the general advance of the art of composition. Previously the only instruments in common use (besides the organ) had been solo instruments, like the flute or the shawm, or at most such petty appliances for producing small groups of tones as the harp and the lute. There was nothing at all adequate for producing sustained and concerted effects except the organ. Neither of the prototypes of the modern piano had come to maturity, the violin was still almost a century away, and of course there was nothing like the true

orchestra. So in the sixteenth century the church organ suddenly asserted itself, both in Italy and in Germany, until it became a powerful artistic influence. Its leadership continued and grew stronger through the seventeenth century, especially in Germany, in spite of the steady rivalry of other instruments. In 1700, when Handel and Bach appear actively in the field, large organs were everywhere common in Northern Europe, dextrous organists were abundant, and the artistic importance of organ music was more or less generally acknowledged. At that time, especially in Germany and England, most prominent musicians were organists of course, very much as to-day most of them are pianists. This fact must be given due weight in estimating the nature of the foundation on which presently was to be rested the whole great fabric of the music of the Classical Period, through which the transition was ultimately made to the styles of the nineteenth century.

Here let us turn back a moment. The existence of well-developed organs and their incessant use as the basis of all church music led to one rather surprising result. The old mediæval Counterpoint had grown in its

own way and within its own field to a perfection in the hands of the great Catholic masters of the sixteenth century that seemed to be final and unsurpassable. The so-called Palestrina style closed a period, and from its rather cold and etherial completeness there was a decided reaction. Italian music, in particular, branched off in the seventeenth century into wholly new undertakings, most of them widely divorced from sacred things. It looked as if the fine art of music in its craving for dramatic expression was now to part company with religion more and more. But just here the spirit of Protestantism stepped in. The new materials and methods of composition of which the Reformation chorales were an illustration were soon subjected to a steady development in combination with the true contrapuntal idea. German organ music began to work over chorale themes in a contrapuntal manner, and in the process to uncover unsuspected possibilities in contrapuntal form. The same drift appeared strongly in German writing for voices. And so before the seventeenth century was done a new school of counterpoint had become established, preserving the essential

principles of procedure in the older style, but applying them with a confident enterprise and independence, and exhibiting at every point a positive power of fresh artistic creativeness. Out of this came forth in the early part of the eighteenth century the splendid polyphony of Handel and Bach. Handel displayed his genius chiefly in his masterly oratorio choruses; Bach chiefly in still more wonderful organ works. The two together made an epoch in musical history, the characteristic feature of which was a display of the latent capacity of contrapuntal expression as made possible and desirable upon the church organ and in church services. The influence of this achievement shows no signs of passing away. The pure Palestrina style is no longer widely known except in the ritual music of the Roman Catholic Church, and exerts no appreciable control upon modern music as a whole. But the impress of Bach upon the present century—and to a less degree of Handel also—is deep and pervasive. The patriarchal leadership of Bach has been acknowledged by hosts of musical workers with a peculiar affectionate reverence, and yet often without any adequate recognition of the plain

fact that this sturdy organist at Weimar and cantor at Leipsic was what he was chiefly because he and all his tribe were steeped in the traditions and the spirit of Protestant church music. The streams of tendency that flow through him and broaden out from him are thoroughly religious and profoundly evangelical.

There are many other related points that might be urged. Modern music is largely dominated by the opera. Yet, if we go back two hundred and fifty years, we find that the opera and the oratorio of that day were almost indistinguishable, both being primitive attempts to give a musical treatment to a dramatic text, secular or sacred. Soon after 1650 they began to separate, though never far enough to lose all traces of kinship. The oratorio, transplanted from Italy to Germany and thence later to England, took on many features from pure church music, and in the hands of Mendelssohn, a Christian Jew, attained a striking culmination as a composite art-form—one of the broadest and noblest in the whole range of music. The educative energy of this particular combination of religious ideas with musical expression is not sufficiently appre-

ciated. Not to speak of the well-known influence of the oratorio in creating and shaping standards of musical taste in a country like England, it may be worth while to remark that in the present century German opera has given evidence of being repeatedly touched by something of the spirit of its sister art-form. It is most interesting, for example, to note how Wagner's mind steadily reverted toward the exaltation of ethical topics, toward the presentation of real soul-struggles, and finally expressed itself in that peculiar religious phantasy, "Parsifal." Music in our day, in obedience to strenuous inner impulses of growth, is pushing out hither and thither, both through vocal and through instrumental forms. It lingers upon all sorts of topics, yields to manifold moods, and addresses manifold tastes. Much of it is evidently non-religious, and some of it is animated by a worldly, sensuous, and even pessimistic spirit. Yet in its total movement it seems to be unable and unwilling to escape from the fascination of religious subjects and sentiments. Often it plainly reverts, consciously or unconsciously, to those religious modes of expressing itself

that once were almost its only available ways of realizing its conceptions. So sometimes it seems to the thoughtful observer as if it were a divine law that music as a fine art must continually return in some way to religion for a fresh impulse of life, must frequently expend its artistic powers with keenest zest upon sentiments that are either religious or proximately religious, and, thus must continue to acknowledge itself still, as it was in all its younger days, the chosen handmaid and interpreter of religious worship and religious enthusiasm.

One cannot tell just how far these phases of music history may be familiar to the ordinary reader, nor how great a value he may be inclined to place upon the view of them that has been here advanced. Their importance may well be thoughtfully weighed by every studious mind, as indicating in what ways the art of music is really indebted to religion, not only for its having grown into a significant fine art, but for no small part of its technical methods and character. This general proposition might be still further developed and illustrated at great length. But it is possible that our

argument thus far may seem over-technical and also a trifle transcendental. Accordingly, it is time to turn the subject about and look upon its reverse side. Whether or not music be so deeply indebted to religion as has been claimed, surely religion as a social institution owes much to music. This is almost a platitude, but yet may profitably be dwelt upon for a moment.

The most striking outward result of the constant association of music with religion is the steady evolution of the great poetic art of Hymnody—a special application of poetry to religious uses that is so extensive and so rich that it merits a whole series of chapters by itself. We can here touch upon only a point or two. For example, very few persons ever stop to consider how much music had to do in giving us the Book of Psalms and in setting it in its canonical place in the Old Testament. Without raising any of the vexed questions as to who wrote all the Psalms and when and under what circumstances, we may safely assert that the *editing* of the Book into its present form was occasioned chiefly by the fact that music had a recognized place in the Hebrew rituals. The selection of the ma-

terials to be included in the completed collection was probably influenced by observing what had proved in experience to be liturgically useful for musical rendering. Possibly many points in the final redaction and arrangement were determined by musical considerations. And certainly the way in which the completed Book passed into habitual usage and became before Christ's time one of the best-known parts of the Old Testament was through song. However rude may have been the artistic quality of Hebrew music and however foreign to our modern notions, it was still music, artistic according to the standards of its time and place. If this practice of music in public worship had not been, the Psalter, with all its inexhaustible richness of thought, imagery and diction, is not likely (humanly speaking) to have been framed as it was, nor to have become universally current as it did.

How signally true this has also been in the long use of the Psalms in the Christian Church! For the Hebrews the Psalter was the only hymn-book. For their Christian successors in some cases it has also been the only hymn-book—of necessity at the outset

of Christianity, and of choice at certain periods since and among certain groups of believers. Other parts of the Scriptures have usually been introduced into public worship by reading; but the Psalms have always been sung if possible, either in chant or motette style. Thus in innumerable instances the whole Psalter has been sung through in order within stated periods—once a year, once a month, once a week, and even once a day. However perfunctory such usages may have been in many instances, they have still served during long ages thoroughly to familiarize at least the clergy with the verbal contents of the Psalms, and, wherever translation into the vernacular has been permitted, the laity as well.

The general point that we are considering might be endlessly illustrated by reference to the history of the gradual accumulation of the vast treasures of Christian hymnody. The composition of hymns has always been due in large measure to the desire to furnish matter for singing, and the practical popularity of hymns has always been closely dependent upon the wide familiarity with them that has come from the reiterated ut-

terance of them in song. The sweep and significance of this fact we shall see more in detail at a later point. Here it is enough to remark that if music had done nothing else for religion than this—to afford an occasion for the Hebrew Psalms and for the far more extensive literature of Christian hymns, as well as to furnish a medium whereby these Psalms and hymns might become popularly known and loved—if music had done nothing else for religion, it would surely have the right to be emphatically honored for its services in the religious world.

But music has certainly done much more —far more than we can here mention except in the most cursory fashion. Those who occupy anything of the Puritan standpoint are apt to think slightingly of the influence of the more elaborate liturgical practices of other branches of the Christian church. They may draw back from desiring to copy these practices in their entirety, and may regret that the formal liturgies have often been combined with objectionable doctrines. But to the historian the popular power of stately rituals is undeniable, and, when carried forward by men of deep

spiritual earnestness, as they have been and still are, their power has told mightily for reverence, for righteousness, for the exaltation of life in an evangelical sense. Now, if you try to analyze the power of such a ritual as that of the Church of England or of the Lutheran Church, you find at once that it lies not only in the literary eloquence of the liturgy proper, and not only in the impress of such visible accessories as noble architecture or ceremonial pomp, but also and conspicuously in the constant intermingling with these of singing and instrumental music. Strike out this latter element, and the persistent and wide-spread popular effectiveness of the whole liturgical system would be infinitely impaired, if not altogether destroyed. We are not here arguing that the system of cathedral services as it obtains in England, for example, is absolutely good in its practical working. The system, however, has been historically a power, and the present importance of the ideals underlying it cannot be ignored. Our only point is that whatever potency it has had or may be intended to have is due in a large degree to its abundant and painstaking use of music.

The same thing is true in an analogous way of our own plainer and much less uniform systems. We also know that religion in its action as a social force is not only a matter of rational cogitation, not only a matter of deliberate volition, but also a matter of somewhat indefinable emotional attitudes. We know that the Church in its services, whereby it makes a manifestation of religion to the world and aims to bring religion effectively to bear upon men, must always use a great variety of modes of approach. It must instruct men and indoctrinate them, and it must persuade them and seek to commit them to voluntary action so as to establish righteous character. But to do these things it must not fail to appeal by every available artistic means to the great magazines of feeling that lie hidden in every human heart. Of these artistic appeals none is on the whole more penetrating or more intense than music. Nothing that can be urged by those who profess themselves to be insensible to musical impressions, or by those who have become righteously exasperated by the misuse of sacred music here or elsewhere, can break the force of this general truth. There is no artistic means of

getting at the internal springs of feeling in the popular heart that can compare with music. The illustrations of this need not be drawn from the splendid cathedral service, with its imposing array of polished weaponry. They can be found in many a humble church in towns and villages where the elaborate ways of the metropolitan sanctuary are practically unknown and where such ways would be egregiously out of place. Sooner or later in the work of a settled pastor in every organized parish the force of this truth makes itself felt. There is a wonderful, indefinable power in the social routine of the church's stated services, taken in their massive totality. This power is plainly made up of several elements. Perhaps if we were talking about preaching, we should magnify that element, and of course set it high in all its ideal glory. But the social power of the institution of public worship is not wholly dependent on preaching, nor on any other one element. It is rather due to the intimate blending in varying proportions and relations of several elements, all of which are important both in themselves and for what they symbolize and suggest. Of these constituent elements

in public worship that give it its social power music is one, and a powerful one, one that the thoughtful observer can never safely neglect or despise. Personal ignorance of music or prejudice against it may distort the views of single investigators, but the great historic fact remains that music has been continuously and universally of the greatest service to religion in accomplishing its work in society through the specific means of public worship. And music occupies this place of power and honor, not by any accident or because of any audacity on its part, but because the Church through long centuries has been nurturing and training it for this service. A moment since we were saying that religion has done much for music. Now we say that music in return has surely done much for religion. Detailed illustration of this latter assertion need not be offered at this point, simply because every stage in the discussion in succeeding chapters is to supply it.

Before we leave this general and preliminary discussion we must devote a few pages to a more abstruse side of our subject, which, however, is helpful to our main pur-

pose. Thus far we have been examining the general fact that between music and religion as a social institution there is a conspicuous connection, so that part of the social power of public worship is due to music as one of its main constituents. Now, if this power of music in public worship exists, it must grow out of some power in music to reach the individuals of which society consists. Nothing is socially influential that is not first of all personally influential. Music would never have been so magnified and honored as a method of religious expression and impression as it has been if it did not have peculiar personal values to those who produce it and to those who hear it. What are these values? Have they any special bearing on our general subject? In particular, has the art of tone some subtle influence upon the inner, subjective, experiential side of religion? Many strenuous advocates of music as a spiritual force make strong statements in this direction. Is their contention extravagant? The proper consideration of this group of questions would take us far afield into the extensive domain of musical æsthetics, and would be out of place here. But we may yet venture to make a few

rapid notes upon them without pretending to offer any exhaustive treatment of the problems involved.

Observe, first of all, that music has a power unmatched among the other fine arts to act as an illuminator of thought and of life because it is an art of progressive action. It is not fixed and statuesque in its forms, like all the pictorial and plastic arts. It gives, not a single, motionless impression, but a continuously unfolding impression. In working out its intentions it has therefore great capacities, not only for repetition and for contrast, but for an organic development of effect through intricate involution in details and through unbroken sequences, gradations and accumulations of its material into extensive wholes. It is not static, but dynamic; not rigid, but infinitely elastic; not pictorial, but dramatic; in short, not inorganic, but vital. These qualities make it a twin-sister of speech, especially of poetic speech. Whether or not music be itself a true language, it is at least so analogous with language that the two can be joined in a union that is not mechanical, but fully sympathetic. The great compound art of Song is possible because music

and speech are akin by nature. Whatever is true of speech as an interpreter of the human spirit and an influence upon it is likely to be true in some sense and in some degree of song.

Now, it is music in the form of song that is prominent in all its religious applications. Religious experience constantly tries to realize itself in words, seeks to bring to utterance what it knows and feels and desires; and, on the other hand, religious experience is largely evoked and shaped by suggestions received through words. Words are needed, both for expression and for impression. The mind must rest with definiteness on certain images, memories, needs, hopes, cravings, aspirations, ideals, such as only words can embody with precision. But the attempt to use religious terms by themselves as a means either of self-realization or of communication brings out in many directions the weakness of mere language as a full embodiment of religious truth and experience. As everyone knows from his efforts to express himself in prayer, mere words often break down in setting forth certain religious attitudes of the soul. The lack in our spoken prayers of an adequate ex-

pression of the emotion that envelopes and permeates the thoughts we have is often due not so much to any real deficiency of feeling in us as to the inherent inadequacy of verbal speech. And what is true of prayer is still more true of such utterances as are attempted in hymns, both those that are meditative or pathetic and those that are jubilant and triumphant. Even the immense resources of poetry as contrasted with mere prose are not sufficient for what we aim to do.

Here music comes in, with an almost magical power to incorporate itself with the words we use, to follow their every movement and suggestion, and to add to them just that color and glow and sweep of emotional momentum that are needed. Music thus presents itself as a true extension of language, giving the latter a scope and an intensity impossible for it by itself. Nowhere does language need this expansion and reinforcement more than in the sphere of religious utterance and intercommunication. The historical and scientific aspects of religion, it is true, are finely supplied with the terms necessary to their use; but these are not the aspects that constitute the

inner side of religion. When one would set forth or address the heart-life and the soul-life that are the home of spiritual experience, he is bound to find mere language pitifully meagre and stiff and cold. Hence in all Christian history men have reached out instinctively and eagerly after every kind of artistic help to fuller expression and suggestion. Painting, sculpture, architecture, dramatic representation, poetry, eloquence—all have been called into religion's service, and in each case with glorious and monumental results. But we may venture to say that none of these religious uses of art has been or in the nature of the case can be greater in variety, significance, or persistent effectiveness than the special religious applications of music. Our American poet, Sidney Lanier, with his prophetic insight, never wrote a truer line than this,—"Music is love in search of a word." We know what infinite meanings he gave to "love," and how he meant by it all that the best spiritual thought could require. And what he affirmed of love might also have been affirmed of hope and peace and joy and all the other cardinal sentiments of the inmost spiritual life. Words alone cannot tell them or

preach them, but song can and does in forms too manifold and etherial to be described. Hence it is that in public worship, where just these sentiments struggle into open manifestation, music, at least in the form of song, becomes practically a necessity.

But we must not omit a further point. Music evidently does not rest wholly upon speech. It is so independent that sometimes it may nullify the words with which it happens to be joined, or may swing off into regions of its own where neither words nor the processes of ordinary thought can exactly follow it. There it seems to be entirely self-centered and self-determined. Indeed, this field of pure music (without words) is that on which the trained musician is apt to dwell as the only one of genuine importance. Without balancing the delicate question of the relative values of music with words and without words, what shall be said about the moral quality and religious value of pure music and of music considered apart from its words? Is such music essentially neutral in these respects, depending wholly on conditions outside itself, as many would have us believe? Or is it open to classifications as to moral and spiritual char-

acter, so that certain types are to be held as unfit for religious use and other types are to be sought and cultivated?

For myself, I must feel that all music is in itself a display of the personality of both composer and performer, and hence an appeal to the personality of the hearer. Like other personal communications, it may have —nay, must have—moral values and implications. Hence, with reference to a particular application, as to the uses of religion, it must be regarded as open to exact analysis and criticism and its actual use as subject to rational judgment. The fitness of any example of musical production for use in public worship does not depend wholly upon its merely formal excellence. Some very poor music has proved itself liturgically useful; and some very perfect music has proved liturgically pernicious. The actual effect depends on so many conditions that at the same moment it may differ in value for different observers and escapes full description in all cases. Yet, even so, we know from the parallel problem of appraising literary effects that there are certain canons of criticism and interpretation that go far toward settling what is the real

or absolute character and value. These can be rationally applied by experts and through education can be made more or less generally appreciated. Musical criticism, however, is as yet in a far more chaotic state than literary criticism. Musicians themselves are not all adepts in their own subject, and popular thought is much bewildered. Hence actual music is often produced and used with a provoking blindness to its moral values, and much passes for religious music that cannot continue always to be regarded as healthy or true. We are all conscious of incongruities and abuses in church music. Sometimes they are so glaring as to give rise to disgust and despair about the whole subject. The attempt to discuss them often leads to bitter differences of opinion, severe collisions of judgment, and even personal estrangements.

These difficulties are certainly most perplexing, and in the sequel we must often refer to them. I mention them here simply for this reason. The very existence of such energetic debate regarding them is an irrefragable evidence of an intuitive perception that music has a real moral and religious power. There never would be such persistent

debates if there were not in the background an obstinate belief that music in connection with religion has certain unattained ideal values. Sacred music would long ago have been laid aside or at least greatly minimized were it not for an instinctive assurance that it might be more than it sometimes is and for an irrepressible demand that it be made more nearly what it ought to be. The real problem about church music is not whether or not it has substantial values with reference to religion as an experience, but how better to realize its ideal by practical means.

HYMNS *and* HYMN-SINGING

It is often supposed that the practical center of the church music problem is the choir and the organist. It is thought that if you can afford to spend much money on these, develop their functions in a highly artistic way, and give them great prominence in your services, so that crowds come from far and near to hear them, you have shown real wisdom and strategic genius. Now, I venture to set at the head of this chapter the proposition that the true center of Protestant music must always be the music of the congregation—hymns and tunes and their practical use. For this let me give one or two reasons.

The peculiarity of the Protestant system of public worship as contrasted with the Roman Catholic is that it assumes that the paramount agent is the body of believers as a whole. Although, of course, instruction and every other influence intended to work upon the congregation must come from designated teachers who stand somewhat apart from it, the fountain of authority and the center of real energy is the congregation itself. In particular, for us worship is not

a spectacle or a vicarious operation, like the Mass, but a personal act on the part of the people individually and collectively. This was one of Luther's explicit contentions, one of the distinctive notes of the whole Reformation movement, and has never been laid aside by any of the churches directly descended from the first Reformers. With us the ministry grows out of the laity, derives thence its warrant and status, and exists only for the sake of ministering to or for the congregation. It is true that expediency has led to a decided concentration of action and apparent authority in the hands of the ministry. Our services often show an astonishingly small amount of actual participation by the congregation, as well as a disheartening indifference of the people to their responsibilities. But the theory is not given up, and the principle is not deliberately doubted.

Now, when Luther set about his reforms, one of his first efforts was to provide practical opportunities for congregational activity in public worship, that the conscious dignity of the individual believer might be asserted and accentuated. His common sense showed him that this was principally to be secured

by the full restoration of congregational song. This involved providing both hymns and tunes. Both of these he himself prepared to some extent, and both he vigorously incited his friends and followers to write or make by adaptation. Before a half-century had passed, the impulse thus given became a tremendous power, for the newly awakened spirit of the Reformation, in Germany and elsewhere, seized with avidity on this mode of expressing and communicating itself. Even before Luther's own work had proceeded far his enemies said that he made more converts by his hymns than by all his preaching. The Reformation doctrine and its enthusiasm were carried far and wide on the wings of song. Wherever the new singing spread, it settled at once into a fixed custom, so that everywhere Protestants were known as "the hymn-singers." This spontaneous movement, which continued without check for more than a century, is highly significant as a sign of the essential relation of hymn-singing to the genius of Protestantism. People always love to sing together in utterance of common sentiments and affections; but in this case they seem to have

specially exulted in the sense of freedom not only to worship, but to do so directly, for themselves, without intermediary or substitute. This sense is one of the glories of Protestantism, and it has nowhere been stronger than in the field of hymn-singing.

But quite aside from this historical and, if you please, doctrinal reason for exalting hymn-singing, there is this further consideration. If church music is to be made to approach to its ideal possibilities, it must be through the personal education of the general body of Christians to the point where they shall regard it as their own and shall actually use it for themselves. It can never be religiously useful in any high degree if it be not truly popular. This means very much more than making it an object of popular attention. It means engaging popular activity in it. Sacred music can never exercise its full ministry among those who are never more than passive listeners to it. What it is and what it signifies can only be fully known through the culture that comes, in part, at least, from personal utterance. If this be so, it is obvious that there is no simpler and more feasible way of extending the popular sense of religious music and of making

music an integral part of public worship than by building up popular hymn-singing. You can always have this, even when you have nothing more. It is possible in some worthy form under nearly all conceivable conditions. It requires the minimum of outlay, and its administration is without serious complications. It is therefore the most universally and immediately practicable form of church music. This is in itself a reason for pushing it into prominence.

But much more needs to be said. Our Christian hymns are surely among the most powerful agencies we have for developing the religious sentiment of our people. The best of them are exquisitely beautiful in form and imagery, are magnetic and noble in tone and spirit, and deal habitually with topics and aspects of truth that all lie close to the heart of the Gospel. As a rule, they spring out of religious experience at its best, and they tend to lift experience to its highest levels. The very cream of truth and of soul-life is gathered into them. They contain the refined riches, the precious essences, the cut and polished jewels of Christianity in all the ages. They tend to be superlative and ideal

in both thought and expression, simply because so often they come from souls of rare endowment and unusual spiritual attainment. They therefore push on far beyond what most of us could perhaps ourselves say in sober truth. But they proclaim and represent nothing but what in our hearts we long for and aspire unto. They often ascend into the realm of ecstasy, and speak as if seeing the invisible and participating in the inaccessible. Herein they are truly prophetic—the records of the insight and intuition and rapture of the seer and the saint. These sublime qualities, of course, are not possessed by all hymns, but they mark so many that in these days it is possible for practical hymn-singing to confine itself to such continually if it chooses.

It is by no means as commonly seen as it ought to be that entirely parallel claims may safely be made for much of the tune music that belongs with our hymns. The best of it, especially in recent periods, is as beautifully articulated as the finest sonnets or the most exquisite miniatures, is rich and thrilling in total effect, and is charged at every point with the same spiritual intensity as the hymns that have called it forth.

Most of our finer tunes are written by men of devout character and sympathies, and are plainly marked by religious fervor and elevation. If we accord the praise of being true revelators and teachers to such poetic artists as Wesley, Cowper, Montgomery, Bishop How, Ellerton, Ray Palmer and many others of the same high rank, we should be ready to give similar acknowledgment to the scores of musical artists who have wrought side by side with them in the same noble ministry, like Gauntlett and Dykes and Barnby and Sullivan and Stainer —not to name others of other schools. Popular appreciation of the interior beauty and nobility of tunes falls behind that of the value of hymns simply because of popular ignorance, and even musical critics are often perversely blind to the triumph involved in writing a really excellent hymn-tune. Sooner or later, however, the one will be valued not less than the other.

These treasures of poetry and music are now so abundant and accessible that there is no excuse for not knowing them or for failing by thoughtful attention to extract something of their inner value. My especial point just here, however, is simply this, that if one

G.M. ELLIOTT LIBRARY
Cincinnati Christian University

will enter upon the study of typical specimens of hymnodic art in a rational and sympathetic spirit, he will find that from them as a center his whole notion of religious music will open out naturally and fruitfully. This is so true that I am tempted to say that unless the student of church music will thus approach the department of hymnody (words and music) he can hardly hope to reach altogether broad and healthy views of the whole subject. Within this department are to be found the norms of thought and sentiment that should dominate the whole. Here is the food that shall nourish true and hearty feeling, and the inspiration that shall quicken enduring enthusiasm. Hymnody is the real nucleus of our church music, not simply because it is characteristically Protestant or because it is mechanically practicable, but because within it are at work the fundamental principles of expression that should control all other church music, presented in forms comparatively easy for the average mind to apprehend.

A proper use of hymnody happily does not presuppose such knowledge as a professional hymnologist may be expected to have.

Hymnody as a field of scientific study is positively appalling in its extent. Let us review a few statistics. The Biblical student finds the Psalter, the only extant collection of Hebrew hymnody, no small problem alone, and yet the Psalter contains only 150 hymns—to which perhaps a score or two may be added from other parts of the Bible. Compared with this small group Christian hymnody spreads out until it seems to have no limits. The brilliant and stimulating hymnody of the various Eastern Churches is but partially explored, but is said to include several thousands of lyrics. The more ponderous and solemn hymnody of the Latin Church adds to these at least 3,500 more hymns, of which an authority like Duffield pronounces several hundreds valuable for all time. These two groups mostly antedate the rise of Protestantism. Since the sixteenth century the multiplication of hymns has been almost inconceivably rapid. German hymnody decidedly overtops all others, with its stupendous total of over 100,000 registered hymns, of which perhaps 10,000 have attained considerable currency and no less than 1,000 are pronounced by competent authority (Schaff) to

be "classical and immortal." Our own English hymnody comes next to the German in magnitude and richness, counting its writers by hundreds and its hymns by tens of thousands. Hymns in other languages are not so numerous, though by no means insignificant. And the vast total is constantly being increased in every corner of the globe to which Christianity has penetrated. In 1891, when Julian's monumental *Dictionary of Hymnology* appeared, it was calculated by the editor that the total number of Christian hymns in all languages was "not less than 400,000." What it is now is unknown, and what it will be fifty years hence, with the marvelous growth of missionary work, can be only timidly conjectured. The matter is overwhelming enough as it stands.

No comprehensive data are available as to the number of tunes that have come into existence and use along with these hymns. The Mediæval Church brought over to us several hundreds of Gregorian melodies. The number of German chorales is certainly many thousands, for a single collection published as far back as 1776 contained a selection of no less than 2,000. An American

student, whose specialty is the tunes of England and America, has a card catalogue in process of construction that already contains over 40,000 entries. The grand total of tunes is also constantly increasing everywhere.

Statistics like these tend to reduce the inquiring mind to a state of numbness and despair. Certainly they give point to the remark just made that a good popular use of hymnody must not be supposed to involve the knowledge of the hymnological expert. It is just here that we must fall back on the invaluable aid of the hymn-book maker. It is his business to know enough of the available material to make a tolerable selection of those hymns and those tunes that it is best to include in a present-day hymnal for a given group or class of churches. This editorial function is rapidly becoming a fine art, and we are now getting many hymn-books for various uses that show both scholarship and practical wisdom. The individual student or a particular church can safely take up such books as have been put forth within the last ten or fifteen years under the auspices of any one of the leading denominations, and proceed

to put it into use, confident that what it contains has been selected for some sort of real excellence. The preparation of worthy books for the prayer-meeting and the Sunday-school is also going on apace. Even books that can hardly be wholly approved by a critical taste often supply interesting material for study.

It is often thought that the whole question of hymn-singing can be solved by simply adopting the right sort of hymn-books. This is specious, but not entirely safe as a rule of procedure. At least, it is worth while to consider it a little. Hymn-books of the higher grade have some obvious advantages aside from the technical excellence of their contents. They are usually so catholic as to offer great variety, and their size affords room for long-continued growth without the danger of the book's seeming to wear out. They are now on the whole so rich and dignified in tone as to appeal to the higher faculties and the deeper feelings. They command respect and tend to induce a self-respecting enthusiasm wherever they can be freely used. Poorer books are usually monotonous, are either sentimental or

sensational, are so deficient in material of an elevated or ideal quality that deliberate efforts to make progress with them are discouraged, and their constant use tends gradually to make hymn-singing a despised and neglected exercise. Yet it is well known that the use of a good hymn-book is not the only condition of success in practical hymn-singing. Most excellent results may be reached with books that are essentially poor; and many a superior book is handled with disgraceful ignorance and feebleness. All churches cannot keep themselves supplied with the most recent books. And besides, there is no little difference of opinion as to what constitutes a really good book. Such a standard or type as is here in mind seems to many good people extreme and unpractical. Rather than spend time on the fruitless task of trying to reconcile differences of opinion about means and methods, let us look somewhat deeper into the matter, and see whether a rational philosophy of action may not help to solve problems of practical administration.

We may safely urge that hymn-singing is fitted to serve three general purposes, whose importance is unquestionable. First, it is

one of the best methods by which a company of people can offer both praise and prayer to God. It is therefore a means of social worship. Second, it is a reactive force on those who engage in it, helping them to define and crystallize their religious thought, stimulating their religious sentiments, and often rousing by suggestion a positive religious ambition. It is therefore a means of spiritual self-culture. Third, it not only draws many persons into a form of united action, so as to declare their actual sympathy and strengthen their sense of real brotherhood, but at the same time there is exerted through it a decided spiritual influence back and forth among those who thus act in concert. It is therefore a means of mutual edification among those who are spiritually-minded and often of evangelistic pressure upon others. Excellence in the mechanism of the exercise and success in its use are to be measured by the degree and manner in which these purposes are realized. Hymn-singing may surely be called successful when it affords an avenue for true approach to God in earnest and noble worship; when it exerts a wholesome and uplifting reflex influence on those who engage in it, establishing them

in the truth and quickening their spirituality; and when it creates a diffused atmosphere of high religious sympathy and vigorous Christian consecration, so that even unbelievers are affected and constrained by it. If it does not accomplish these results in some real sense, it cannot be called successful.

Judged by these standards, not a little hymnody that is thought to be excellent proves to be poor, and *vice versa*. We are all familiar with the tedious debate about the value of the whole class of hymns and tunes commonly called "Gospel Hymns." Much of the criticism of these "Hymns" is reckless, both because it fails to note the fact that different grades of artistic beauty in poetry and music have always been required among Christians of differing degrees of culture, and also because it assails indiscriminately a class of hymns and tunes that is not homogeneous enough to be either approved or condemned in bulk. But, on the other hand, the common defense of even the best of the "Gospel Hymns" is often weak, especially when it appeals chiefly to their quick outward success among

masses of people who are plainly thoughtless and shallow. Both the attack and the defense should be more careful. The assailants of the system have sometimes weakened their case by basing it too exclusively on reasons of taste, without showing how vulgarity is dangerous because more or less false, and by failing to leave room for practices that are provisional and transitional and that are therefore defensible in their place. The defenders of this popular hymnody have a right to urge that hymnody must adapt itself to actual conditions, that the immature and uncultivated cannot be driven by force into a full appreciation of the most highly poetic hymns or the most highly musical tunes; but they often very gravely underestimate the capacity of the popular mind to rise above vulgar embodiments of truth and to shake itself free from perverted sentimentality, and they constantly mistake the zest of animal enjoyment in a rub-a-dub rhythm or the shout of childish pleasure in a "catchy" refrain for real religious enthusiasm.

For myself, I am disposed to believe that the original impulse toward the so-called "Gospel Hymns" was emphatically good,

that much of their practical use has been worthy, and that some of them are likely to continue useful in many conditions. I even think that the whole movement has tended to break down whatever of stiffness and frigidity there is in our hymnody, and to liberate it from what in other fields would be called its "academic bias." Perhaps all its good results in these directions are not yet fully manifest. Yet I cannot help deploring certain other results. These evil consequences are perhaps not universal, but they are at least common enough to be matters of notoriety.

From the standpoint of general culture it is clear that the exclusive use of ephemeral hymns and tunes is harmful because it has prevented the knowledge of others that are too precious inheritances from the past to be discarded. Even our more intelligent young people are singularly ignorant of standard and historic examples of hymnody. I will give but a single instance. John Newton's splendid hymn on the Church beginning

> "Glorious things of thee are spoken,
> Zion, city of our God,"

I have often found to be totally unknown, even to college graduates, though it is not far away in class from the best of the "Gospel Hymns." That it is now about a century and a quarter old and has been in continuous use all that time is not necessarily to its discredit. I have become somewhat wary about asking people what they know of many of our standard tunes. Our churches have practically turned their backs on nearly all of the German chorales—except for purposes of literary allusion. And even many of the standard chorales of the last century in England, like "St. Thomas" (about 1760) or the original "Rockingham" (1790), with many from a later time, like "Lancashire" (1836), are too often not even known to exist. The same is true of many scores of fine tunes from the last forty years, the fruits of a most notable and influential new school of tune-writing, which have won distinction and honor. These latter, it is true, do not have quite the jingle of college glees or such songs as are sung at minstrel-shows and on the streets, yet many of them have truly popular qualities of form. Sullivan's "St. Gertrude" and Dykes' "Lux Benigna" and Monk's

"Eventide" have secured some recognition among those devoted to "popular" hymnody; but where are their companions and equals and superiors? This evil—the exclusion of standard and fine hymns and tunes by those of less value, but not less practicality—is real and deplorable. Different observers, with varying experience and with varying opinions about what is most worthy of preservation, would put the matter in different ways and cite different examples, but all would unite in saying that the rage for hymns and tunes written by the yard for wide sale among churches in search of what is cheap and easy has been and is a serious evil.

But, without dwelling on this, let us turn back to the three canons of criticism mentioned a moment ago and test them in practical application. Hymn-singing, it was said, is largely intended to be the utterance of worship to God. How does this bear upon the criticism of ways and means in the exercise? Plainly thus, at least, that it should lead us steadily to lay aside what we are ashamed of and what we feel is an unworthy tribute to God, and to replace it

by what we recognize to be better. God has the right to be worshipped with the best we have or can secure, even if the process of getting and bringing it costs us something. Indeed, if it costs nothing it means nothing. Every item of worship is an offering of joy and devotion to Him, and its worthiness is to be measured by what it means to the offerer. In too many prayer-meetings and other church services the devotional dignity of hymn-singing has been destroyed on this side. A poor book is used, which the people know to be poor and in their heart despise, because they are too mean to get a better one. Poor selections are kept in use, against which the feeling of the users more or less revolts, because they are too lazy and indifferent to attempt better ones. The leaders, both the minister and his musical helpers, have fallen into a disconsolate apathy about the exercise, and let it drag along in a stupid, poverty-stricken, listless fashion, not because they are without a sense of its manifest inferiority, but because they are averse to the effort to make it better. It will be noticed that it is not said that all churches should use the same books or the same hymns and

tunes or the same general methods, for all churches are not alike. But the use by any church of that which it knows to be unworthy of itself and of God is so shameful that it is almost blasphemous. Counterfeit coin on the contribution-plate, vacant lip-service in the prayers, and doggerel and trash in the hymnody are pretty much alike as tributes of worship. But one person cannot always judge for another in this latter case. Let us leave the door wide open for the use by others of what seems to us unworthy just so far as we see it to be sincerely devotional to them and really the best that they can offer. But let us have no mercy on ourselves if we are satisfied with what we know to be poor, or if we fail to try to lead others upward from immature or mistaken standards to the higher ones that we have learned to set up for ourselves. In all such efforts for improvement let us constantly appeal to the right motive, namely, the duty and privilege of honoring God by bringing to Him only what is our best. The first chapter of the prophecy of Malachi strikes the key-note of the subject on this side.

The second purpose of hymn-singing was

found in its reflex influence on the spirituality of those who use it. This, again, is a criterion to be used with caution with regard to others, except in a generalized form, but one to be applied with rigor to ourselves. The value of a whole class of hymns (not to speak of tunes) can often be fixed by observations of its total effect upon a period or a large body of believers. It has often been remarked that the sterling quality of the Scottish character is partly due to the persistent use for generations of the Scottish metrical version of the Psalms, with its singular earnestness and directness. Probably the peculiar power of Methodism throughout its history can be traced with some assurance to the domination in its hymnody for more than a hundred and fifty years of the intense and noble genius of Charles Wesley. While I am not a headlong admirer of the type of hymnody established by Dr. Watts, I cannot help sometimes wishing that our churches to-day might more often come under his rather austere and over-dogmatic constraint. Hymnody is, of course, first of all a fruit of its time and environment. But it has also proved itself over and over again to be

a power upon later times and amid wholly different circumstances.

Be this as it may, the value of any particular hymn is partly to be judged by the state of opinion and sentiment in which its actual use leaves you. Is it true in its thought of God and of Christ, in its reference to all the manifold aspects of sin and salvation, in its representation of the spiritual life? And is it healthy in general tone, affecting in its imagery and masterful in its progress, and sufficiently noble to awaken enthusiasm for what it treats? These are severe tests, but are they not fair ones? If you would realize what sort of clarifying they give to this whole subject, form the habit, whenever you use a hymn, of watching its every feature in detail and of summing it all up at the end. If it belongs to the subjective class, challenge it with questions like these. Was it written out of a deep experience of the Gospel? Does it fittingly embody some part or aspect of such an experience? Is it so wrought out that it is true in your own soul-history or true to your ideals? If it be objective, try it with such queries as these. Is the picture it gives of the nature or providence or grace

of God, or of Christ's offices or person, or of the ministry of the Spirit, or of the Christian Church and its activities, joys and hopes, or of the life that now is, or of the life beyond—is the picture that it gives of any of these one that commends itself to you as true? Is it presented with sympathy and insight? Does it have majesty and contagious power? And how does it all affect *you?* Does the attempt to make it your own expression give you a wider vision, quicken into life your dormant sensibility, and rouse within you a higher aspiration? Are you helped to be a larger and a better Christian by it? Questions like these, I repeat, are fair questions. They must be asked more or less consciously by every intelligent and earnest participant in any religious exercise. The hymns that we can call good must be on the whole those that do us good in these ways. Only let us beware as we answer such questions that we are not misled into snap-judgments, into foolish misinterpretations, or into the vagaries of mere prejudice. The popular exegesis of hymns is sometimes much worse than the popular exegesis of the Bible, bad as that occasionally is. Criticism of this

searching kind must have a sound and accurate basis, in hymnody as in other weighty matters. The application of tests like these is sufficient to disclose the weakness and even vacuity of many a hymn in vogue among us, and the essential excellence of many another that we have but partially known.

But we have noted that the influence of hymnody does not stop with the thoughtful and devout user who can make such an analysis as has been advocated. To the heedless user or hearer, to one not at all advanced in spiritual maturity, or to one who stands outside the Christian fraternity and regards it from a distance, its power is different. Here comes in our third criterion of excellence—the demonstrative and affirmative power of hymns upon such indifferent, immature, or half-participating users. For such persons every hymn that they hear or sing establishes something of a general perspective, offers a general suggestion, sketches in some outlines, from which they unconsciously make up a general conception of what Christianity is and how it works. This vague and unnoticed factor in the problem must not be neglected.

To measure its importance, try to imagine yourself not only not a Christian, but quite unfamiliar with Christians and their ways. Suppose yourself to have dropped in at some prayer-meeting or other service where hymn-singing is a prominent feature. Then, remembering that hymns almost always delineate Christianity in terms of life, are rescripts of inner thought or experience, whether subjectively or objectively presented, try to estimate the impression that you would probably gain from them of the nature of Christian faith and feeling. Doubtless in the midst of some actual service you have once in a while paused thus to put yourself in imagination outside the inner circle of the assembly and have really felt what a mere stranger or spectator might feel. Probably you can remember cases in which the impression thus gained was positively startling for its emptiness, its childishness, its narrowness, and you have wondered how you or anyone else could thus misrepresent the essence of the life that is "in Christ." Probably, too, you can recall other cases in which you felt yourself in the presence of a thrilling ex-

hibition of spiritual vitality that was like a glimpse into heaven. Practical hymnody must always be ready for this kind of test, for in every assembly of any size there are those whose mental attitude is so inert or indifferent that they are only partial participants, and every service of public worship, because it is public, may address many who are not true participants at all. We surely have no right to allow the conception of Christianity to be lowered in such minds by trivial, perverted or misleading presentations of it. The popular impression of our religion is not derived from a study of creeds or theological treatises, not altogether from sermons or similar formal expositions, but largely from such spontaneous revelations of it as we make of our inner selves in action. Hymnody is one such display of life, and is so regarded. Our whole policy about it deserves to be soberly directed accordingly.

We now have before us three desirable forms of efficiency in hymn-singing, namely, efficiency for worship or devotion, efficiency for self-culture or edification, and efficiency

for evidential or evangelistic demonstration. The question follows, What can be done to increase these?

We may well begin by saying that the habit of using hymn-singing in a merely casual or mechanical way should be condemned as simply disgraceful. It is hard to be patient with a minister or Sunday-school superintendent or evangelist who employs it chiefly as a stop-gap, as a cover for disorder, or to counteract physical restlessness. No liturgical exercise can keep its dignity or its efficiency if the impression is given that it is meant only as a pastime, or an interlude, or a piece of calisthenics. Hymn-singing, if used at all, has a right to a place in the main current of the service, instead of being made an eddy at its side or an interruption and interference. We have all known cases where we have wished that hymn-singing might be wholly interdicted for a season, in the hope that the regimen of abstinence might in time beget again a more healthy appetite for it and the power to assimilate its nourishment. The blame for the relaxation in the tension of mental energy whenever a hymn is used almost always falls on the leaders. Some-

times the selection of words or music is manifestly careless and faulty, or their giving out is slovenly and weak, or the general manner of treatment in detail betrays indifference or stupidity. Faults like these must be remedied by the leaders themselves. If hymns are worth having, they are worth choosing and handling with the same conscientiousness as is bestowed upon the prayers and the sermon. There is no logical escape from this axiom.

Difficulties, however, arise even when leaders have good intentions and exercise due discretion. One difficulty is popular ignorance of the richness of hymnody on both its poetic and its musical sides. Ignorance can be met only by some process of education, most of which in this case must be instigated and guided by ministers and church musicians. Prayer-meetings and second services on Sunday may often be well devoted to the thoughtful study of hymn-writers and tune-writers, of the periods and tendencies that they represent, of various characteristic treatments of particular subjects and sentiments, or of the place of influence that hymn-singing has filled in the history of the Church. The

analysis of familiar examples may well lead to the study of less familiar ones, to tactful criticism and comparison, and to the setting up of sound general principles of judgment. It has sometimes been soberly urged that popular hymnody must deliberately avoid much that appeals strongly to the artistic tastes. I believe just the reverse. Hymnody is a form of religious art, and beauty is the soul of art. Every effort should be made to touch the keenest literary sense and the keenest musical sense, to magnify every delicacy of form and suggestion and plan, and thus to demonstrate that the best hymns are fine as lyric poetry and the best tunes fine as pieces of compact and nervous composition. In these regards the hymnody of the last half-century certainly averages much higher than that of previous times, though every period has its gems. All religious poetry is not available for hymns, of course, and all religious music is not transformable into tunes, but both hymns and tunes may be shown to have their best inspiration in genuine and lofty artistic creativeness.

Educational effort should be brought to bear where it will do the most good. It

surely should not be confined simply to the older people. Children and young folks have quick appreciation and few prejudices. Other things being equal, the Sunday-school is generally the most promising place in which to work out progressive hymnodic ideas, especially on the musical side. The full sense of some hymns will be caught only vaguely, no doubt, but many of the richest tunes are more readily learned by young people than by adults. In the long run the general grade of a church's hymn-singing will be found to be fixed by the Sunday-school. Hence here there should be especial care taken. Here at least we cannot afford to have less than the best available book or less than the best available musical leadership. Here the pastor and the superintendent and the teachers have a distinct opportunity to build for the future, hymnodically as in other ways.

In this connection, also, it ought to be suggested that the Young People's Societies can do the whole life of the parish good by sometimes taking up hymns and tunes as a special object of study, mapping out regular work upon them and undertaking systematic reading about them, occasionally

devoting whole meetings to them, and cultivating a real ambition to excel in the knowledge of them. Special classes or clubs can sometimes be organized for such study. I have known many cases in which tactful ministers have found this agency of peculiar value in gaining the personal interest of both young and old, and in directing their thoughts to the highest themes.

All such educational work, whether carried on in regular services or through special lectures, classes or rehearsals, will prove but moderately effective unless combined with thorough attention to details as hymn-singing occurs in the ordinary routine of services. At the risk of being overminute, let us briefly notice one or two points of practical management.

The usual impulse is to approach hymn-singing too exclusively from the musical side. This needs to be offset by explicit emphasis on the hymns. The minister should choose every hymn with exact reference to its place in the service, particularly with regard to what precedes it. Hymns are expressive exercises, not impressive. They should very rarely be employed with a didactic or hortatory purpose, especially

if to be sung congregationally. Normally they grow out of conditions of feeling that have been engendered by other means, and so should be appended to some other exercise as responses by the congregation to what has come to it in the way of instruction or counsel. The common practice of beginning services with a hymn or the doxology is defensible only on the supposition that the congregation is strongly affected by the general impress of the hour or the place or the act of assembling. As a rule, at least, a few choice words of Scriptural reminder or exhortation or ascription should lead up to a first hymn, so as to give it a liturgical *raison d'être*. Later, a hymn should usually follow the chief Scripture-reading, or, if a prayer be inserted there, should prolong the expressive movement of that exercise. Similarly, after the sermon or address, a hymn should follow either at once or with a prayer as the natural outlet of such feeling as the instruction received may be supposed to have generated. In prayer-meetings and the Sunday-school similar connections are to be sought as far as possible, with a freer use of hymns of fraternal fellowship in addition to those of

direct worship. It is the leader's duty to plan these antiphonies of song with all possible ingenuity. And often he ought to make his purpose plain by a few pointed words of introduction as he gives out the hymns. This practice of prefacing singing by explanation or incitement may easily be overdone, but has no small value when judiciously pursued. The great desideratum is that a hymn should never be used except with a logical reason for it which the congregation can readily infer or which is actually indicated in some way. Let the singing constantly be shown to have a definite intellectual and spiritual basis, and it will prove to have in it a principle of genuine vitality. From this point of view it is plainly easier to develop interest in the exercise by proceeding from the hymns to the tunes than from the tunes to the hymns.

Yet the choice and treatment of the tunes are matters of great importance by themselves. The actual knowledge and experience of the congregation must be fully considered. Musical expediency must often modify mere theory or even praiseworthy ambition. In any one service the tunes should be varied enough to provide for

more than one grade of capacity and taste. Opportunities should not be neglected to show by brief comments how certain tunes enhance the words set to them and how the music proves a fitting utterance for their dominant mood or sentiment. Tunes are good only as they enable hymns to rise to a higher power and a fuller expressiveness. With tunes as with hymns the leader constantly has the chance to elevate the tone of practical usage and to shape its progress by intelligent and illuminating remark. The average minister, it must be confessed, is still usually deficient in equipment for this sort of leadership. Yet even the most technically ignorant can utilize means to supply his own lack by calling in the help of others who know more.

The mechanical treatment of tunes by church musicians calls for special mention. Although, as has been noted, congregational singing depends fundamentally on the attitude of the people's minds, it depends immediately and proximately on the kind of musical leadership provided. The spirit of the choir is important. They must be cordial and sympathetic, animated by a sincere desire to encourage activity on the part of

the congregation. But more important still is the attitude of the organist. He always has it in his power to make or break congregational singing. This function in his work should be held to be primary for every church organist. It is his business to be rightly informed as to the nature of congregational music and constantly aware of his responsibility for its success. And he must be able to play tunes correctly, artistically, and with contagious enthusiasm. This cannot be put too strongly. The technical incapacity just here of many otherwise skilful players is astonishing. Tune-playing is often difficult—far more so than even musicians realize,—for it involves considerable familiarity with the details of musical construction and a special facility of the fingers. But it is so fundamental in church music that one who calls himself a church musician must master it. This is not the place to go into details, as I have tried to do elsewhere.* It is enough here to have registered this general opinion. In their search for organists our churches should set this matter in the foreground,

* Four articles in *The New York Evangelist*, February and March, 1894.

as we are told was done in the case of the late Sir Arthur Sullivan at an early point in his career.* It is far better to spend money for a skilful player of tunes for the church services, the prayer-meetings and the Sunday-school, and limit the music to hymn-singing, than to sacrifice the latter in favor of the most exquisite choir music or the most popular organ recitals.

Instead of imagining that congregational singing is hard to secure and maintain, let us be very sure that in the majority of cases it is simply waiting to be given a fair chance. It will fail, of course, in congregations where there is no spiritual earnestness, no religious life that craves expression. It cannot assert itself in the face of ministerial neglect or shameful musical blundering. But it responds gloriously whenever the requisite ground is provided for its growth and whenever it is cultivated with affectionate commonsense. And wherever it exists in some healthy form, the church music system may be said to be properly based and centered. Upon this as a basis and around this as a center other forms

* See *The Musical Times*, January, 1901, pp. 22–23.

of music may arrange themselves so as powerfully to increase and elevate the whole life of the church. But whether it is always practicable or not to reach out after these other forms of music, good congregational music is surely possible and desirable for every church, and through such music alone a large part of music's ministry to religion may be realized.

THE CHOIR

THE administration of the choir and its music is conceded to be in most of our American churches a difficult problem. The mere discussion of phases of this problem has often proved distressingly provocative of serious differences of opinion, of many bitter feelings, and of some out-and-out quarrels. Hence the fugitive anecdotes and squibs in the public press relating to church music usually turn on some aspect of the assumed incompatibility of choirs with that for which churches exist, or of churches with that for which choirs think themselves to exist. Hence ministers of wide experience often advise special caution in dealing with this subject, and their younger brethren are either hopelessly timid about it or are bold only with the proud recklessness of youth. Hence in certain parishes there appears a peculiar sensitiveness concerning all choir matters, traceable to the memory of some ancient contest that disturbed the peace or perhaps scandalized the community. In many places are found leading music teachers who have skilfully manipulated the local choirs and their policy

for their own professional aggrandizement, apparently regarding the churches on this side as fair game for the cleverest hunter. In other cases we find that good musicians have grown weary of trying to preserve self-respect as choir managers, and hence have withdrawn from all active connection with church music. The choir usages of our churches vary indefinitely. Some have no choir music, or only a little of an indifferent sort. Others have so much and push it forward so insistently that it seems to occupy most of their church horizon. In some the chorus choir is magnified, while in others emphasis is laid on the asserted superiority of the quartette. Our Episcopal friends evince a growing predilection for the boy choir, with its peculiar difficulties and its unpredictable results, at least in ordinary American conditions. As to the choice of music, a great variety of styles are in vogue among us, ranging from the solid intellectuality of the better English school to the most extreme operatic forms that can be afforded or to other forms in which sentimentalism is dominant. In many churches the choir music oscillates aimlessly and helplessly from one style to another.

As we glance about us, therefore, at the threshold of our subject, the prospect is bewildering and not entirely enticing. One cannot help being puzzled by the strong differences of opinion expressed, as well as distressed by the spirit of combativeness often shown. So one may well hesitate about seeming to assume any dogmatic tone in treating the subject, realizing that in such confused conditions there must be room for many varieties of practical policy and for many exceptions to what may be urged as general rules.

For myself, it ought to be said at the outset that I heartily believe in choirs and choir music. I believe that this department is necessary for the proper rounding out of our church music system, since it can furnish elements not otherwise possible, and elements, too, of great importance. Its theoretical correlation with congregational music is easily definable, its historic dignity and usefulness can be demonstrated in a variety of ways, and its practical management presents no difficulties that are not surmountable in some way everywhere. In support of these views we need only dwell upon a few selected points, seeking chiefly

to develop those lines of thought that are constructive and positive, so as to magnify those aspects of the subject that have real interest and real promise.

In the Mediæval Church the choir was practically the whole of the musical system. This resulted from the mediæval notion of the Church and its services. The Church was understood to consist of the clergy, and its services were functions of the clergy. Hence the choir was composed of clerical assistants and was conducted solely with reference to the due performance of music as a part of the clerical liturgy. The laity was not particularly necessary to the system at any point, except, of course, as a general field for the propagation of the faith and as a source of ecclesiastical revenue. Choir music was organized and carried on without much regard to its popular effects and without any popular participation in its management. Its methods and styles, especially as developed under the strong idealism of the contrapuntal theory, were radically non-popular and often positively unpopular. The whole theory of the musical system, in short, was oligarchical and

exclusive. To-day this mediæval theory still persists in the Roman Catholic Church, though its practical workings have been extraordinarily modified by secularizing tendencies or by contacts with Protestantism.

The outbreak of the Reformation, as we have seen, brought with it a complete change of emphasis in the church music system. Congregational music became central and achieved a prodigious success within a comparatively brief period. But Luther, at least, clung tenaciously to the choir as also a valuable agency. He knew the beauty of the old motette music, and the spiritual possibilities of a form of song that stood somewhat apart from the congregation and that used means that no congregation could handle. As compared with the Lutheran Churches of Germany, the Reformed Churches in Western Europe were on the whole much less attentive to choir music, though not directly hostile to it except perhaps at first. The English Church alone adopted Luther's principles (though not because they were his), and before the sixteenth century was over had already fully established a style of choir music that at many points still challenges

our admiration. Both these beginnings developed into systems that continue to the present time; and so, if one is looking for cases of the historic eminence of the choir under Protestant conditions, he will find himself chiefly concerned with the German and the English types. In these two cases we see the results of efforts extending through many generations amid conditions that have been comparatively stable. During the last three centuries neither the Lutheran nor the Anglican liturgical system has been greatly changed. Consequently, every point in their musical practices is supported by settled and pervasive traditions, the fruits of much disciplined thought and experience. These two are so rich in suggestion that only a brief study will show them to be just occasions for worthy pride and profoundly important as indications of what choir music may be. In both cases there has been a steady unfolding, with an accumulating treasury of works and other resources, so that to-day in either of these two countries choir music often has the quality of a remarkable culmination. This should be said with emphasis, in spite of all necessary qualifications and abatements.

All this is in strong contrast with our American situation. We here are in the midst of a liturgical evolution so different that it belongs to another hemisphere in more senses than one. We have no dominant state church, outside of the Episcopal denomination we have no fixed liturgy, and we can hardly be said to have any recognized body of ecclesiastical traditions, musical or otherwise. We certainly cannot claim to have any uniform standards for the profession of church musician, and in particular for choir music we have only recently begun to have any extensive and characteristic literature or other guide to procedure of our own. We have not yet passed beyond the experimental stage of our development on this side. There are at work within us certain strong general principles and certain instincts, but they have not yet fully come to bear upon our own liturgical problems, which we can easily see are infinitely more intricate than any that have confronted Protestantism hitherto. Doubtless here is to be found the sufficient explanation of the confusion of the church music problem as it stands with us to-day. Here, too, is to be found a cause for special aspira-

tion, for with us is lodged the care for much of the future welfare of Protestantism among the nations. Plantings of the Kingdom in new and difficult conditions are not delivered from the obligation to "bring forth much fruit".

The whole subject before us is illuminated by frequently turning back to consider just what a choir can do and ought to do. Probably most thoughtful students would agree on the main objects in view, but a restatement of them may have practical suggestiveness.

The first purpose of the choir is to support and foster congregational singing. All singing requires leadership and magnetic inspiration. In this function of leadership the organist should be able to depend upon whatever body of singers is gathered about his as his assistants. Here I mean much more than a vague moral sympathy. I mean, of course, that a first reason for a choir's existence is that it may furnish a vocal nucleus to which the voices of the people can attach themselves, a positive mass of harmony in which every singer in the congregation can find his place with

confidence and comfort. The initial efforts in choir development should be put forth in this direction, and whatever more elaborate undertakings may be added, this fundamental duty should never be forgotten. Churches owe it to themselves to emphasize this function in laying out the work expected of their musical officials. If musicians have sometimes failed to give this side of their work prominence, the blame has often rested on the church's uncertainty about what it needed and wanted.

A choir acting in this capacity—as congregational leader and guide—is simply a specialized segment of the congregation itself. It is a part slightly separated in thought and action with direct reference to the fuller activity of the whole. Theoretically this function is best exercised by a choir composed of many voices—more or less of a chorus—since a chorus presents a better pattern of the congregational chorus that it would call out, and since a chorus gives an absolutely fuller body of tone, comparatively undominated by individual voices. But practically congregational leadership can be well exercised by a small body of singers, by a quartette or even by a pre-

centor. In any case care is needed to see that leadership is consciously intended and accomplished. To this end some special vocal training is often required, so as to secure vigor of attack and sustained sonority. Solo singers are not always successful in achieving these most useful qualities of style. And the act of leading should of course include a conscious mental effort on the singers' part to transmit to the people through their singing a forceful suggestion of the inner sense and beauty of both hymns and tunes, so that the guidance provided shall not be simply tonal and rhythmical, but intellectual and spiritual. The popular heart is quick to respond to whatever is instinct with real vitality of conception and sentiment, and the choir treatment of hymn-singing can be made to serve as a genuine inspiration and revelation. Indeed, if it does not reach this level, it is really inefficient.

The second function of the choir grows directly out of the first. Hymn-singing, we noticed, is an exercise designed to be a form of expressive action on the part of the congregation, expressive, that is, of its devotional or fraternal thoughts and feelings.

Through it both praise and prayer are offered to God as acts of direct worship, and through it, also, the congregation declares itself in mutual words of zeal, love, hope, aspiration, and the like. But congregational hymn-singing has obvious limitations on the musical side. It can hardly be expected, save in exceptional cases, to pass beyond the use of simple forms like the chant and the hymn-tune. Yet the tonal embodiment of prayer and praise and of declarative utterances of all kinds tends constantly to stretch far beyond these smaller musical forms. The uses of music for these expressive purposes are surely not to be confined wholly to what an accidental, heterogeneous and untrained assembly can accomplish; and no plan of special study or discipline exists whereby the average American congregation can be brought to a point of technical skill sufficient to compass these higher forms of musical utterance. Here the choir comes in to extend and supplement congregational action as a vicarious agency. Choir music, then, is partly designed to supply forms of congregational expression that the people in general are technically unable to offer in person. This function, it will be

observed, is distinctly representative in nature. It may even be styled priestly, though not without some reservations as to the scope of that term.

In the development of choir music in connection with the fixed, historic liturgies there has always been a tendency greatly to magnify this particular function. Imbedded in these liturgies, usually placed as responses to Bible-readings, are a number of prescribed canticles, like the *Benedictus* and the *Te Deum,* whose chief burden is devotional in the strict sense, either adoring ascription, or thanksgiving, or humble petition, or some combination of these. The texts of these are prose, or at least not metrical poetry, and so are not adaptable to metrical tunes, though they may be chanted. Except as they are treated in chant-form, these canticles, being more or less invariably used, constitute a special field for choir effort within which it is expected continually to exercise itself. Consequently, for use in connection with these liturgies a large and striking body of anthems has been called forth in many different styles, and through their widespread use a certain type of choir music has acquired peculiar promi-

nence in the popular mind. This development is plainly of much universal utility, even outside the churches in which it originated. All services, at least those of a formal and public character, should rise to heights of exuberant exultation, of passionate supplication, of intense declaration, and such heights are perhaps best attained through prose hymns, like certain of the Psalms and of the historic Christian formulæ, which cannot be adapted by combination with tunes to actual congregational use. The introduction into our ordinary services of some choir music of this description is therefore clearly desirable wherever it can be properly managed.

Just here, however, let us not forget to think soberly and as we ought to think. Perhaps one or two words of caution may not be amiss even for the thoughtful student. This whole class of anthems, especially when expressive of adoration and thanksgiving, shows a strong tendency to rise far above the planes of ordinary sentiment even more than our conspicuously ideal hymns. Their original selection was for an elaborate type of public worship, and their musical treatment is generally some-

what stately and ornate in consequence. Many such anthems, then, are so exalted and intense as to be unsuited for indiscriminate or constant use. If employed too freely, they run the risk of being grotesquely incongruous with neighboring exercises, as well as of soaring away into regions of ideality where the average congregation cannot follow. Their frequent use in unsuitable connections or in an unsympathetic atmosphere is sure to lead to some sort of reaction from them or insincerity in them. The text of every anthem needs to be carefully weighed as to its general sense and predominant tone. If it be an utterance of ecstatic jubilance or triumph or even of extreme confession or entreaty, particularly if these qualities are heightened by the musical treatment (as they ought to be), it is clear that such an anthem should not be inserted in any service except in a place where it will seem to grow naturally out of its immediate surroundings and where by some means the minds of the congregation have been prepared to adopt it as substantially their own. The reckless insertion of such musical praise or prayer works only liturgical confusion and often ends in gen-

erating a diffused liturgical imbecility. The *Te Deum*—surely one of the grandest of the great hymns to Christ—has perhaps been more maltreated in this regard than any other, but the danger belongs to the class it represents rather than to any one example.

The practice, still very common, of beginning services with an elaborate anthem of strong praise is open to grave practical objections. Such an anthem is apt to be what it was once vulgarly called, a "show-piece", a prodigious display of vocal pyrotechnics before the service proper begins. This sort of thing is actually defended as a useful way of making the choir feel its importance, or of entrapping the curious stroller on the streets, or of getting back in the currency of the concert stage the expenditure upon choir salaries. Opening anthems are by no means impossible or wholly undesirable, but they have been so widely abused by both choirs and congregations that they should be required to justify themselves fully in matter and manner for the place in services that they are supposed to occupy. Those usually chosen in many cases are really only suitable for some cul-

minating point in the service instead of its comparatively inert beginning. Unfortunately, under the management of some ministers and in certain states of popular feeling our services seem to have no decided culminations, and so in some instances perhaps the best of the anthems we are here considering are never practicable.

What has just been said leads to another remark, obvious enough in its truth, but not a little puzzling in its practical bearings. All anthems expressive of direct worship need to be treated as essentially congregational in origin and character. They are not addressed to the people, but offered on their behalf. To achieve this as a positive fact is very difficult, since it involves an eminent degree of self-control on the part of all the parties engaged, both choir and congregation. The singers must sing as distinctly conscious that they are only substitutes for the real agents, and the congregation must appropriate the singing as if it were its own. Nothing can bring this about in most cases except long-continued processes of ministerial guidance, reinforced by the cordial coöperation of the organist and the choir. There are radical dif-

ferences between church music and concert music, which all thoughtful persons know both by instinct and by reflection, but in too many churches these differences have been so much obliterated that a simply concertistic style of music has completely driven out the true church style. This result, wherever it is found, is an unmixed evil, for which usually the blame is to be distributed among the minister and the musicians and the people.

Doubtless one of the occasions of the trouble has often been the heedless use of the quartette form of choir, which is a peculiarly American institution. Such choirs, to be artistically good, must usually be made up mostly of those who are professional or semi-professional concert-singers. It is naturally hard for them to leave their customary frame of mind behind them when they enter the church door, and equally hard for the people to regard them as they sing during the service in any but the ordinary light of the parlor or the concert-hall. But the case is not hopeless, as some quartettes have finely demonstrated on their part, and as many a congregation is ready to show on its part under the stimu-

lus of a little tactful suggestion and help. The difficulty, however, is not confined to any one form of choir, but belongs to all vicarious exercises in public worship that rise to any considerable pitch of artistic intensity. Only by means of a diffused thoughtfulness and a constant desire and determination on the part of all who engage in such exercises can they be prevented from becoming spectacular and sensational instead of truly devotional.

Without lingering here for further details, we hasten on to the third function of the choir, which is antithetic to the second or reciprocal to it. The choir is properly a specialized branch of the ministry and exists for the same purposes. Like the ministry, it is to serve the congregation not only as leader in whatever it can do itself, and not only as substitute and representative in whatever it cannot do itself directly, but also as the teacher and inspirer of the congregation. With us the minister exercises the functions both of prayer-offerer and of preacher. He is both priest and prophet. At one moment his face is turned upward in worshipful address to God, the next it is turned downward in didactic and hortatory

address to men. His activity is both expressive for the people and impressive upon them. So with the choir. The office of its music is certainly two-fold, to serve as an expressive utterance toward God and to provide impressive instruction and stimulus for the congregation.

The distinction between these two forms of liturgical action is far too vaguely apprehended by many minds, and is far too carelessly treated as a principle in the practical administration of public worship. Certainly in choir management there is a surprising inattention to it. Anthems are not properly classified by those who select them. Examples of the two classes are constantly rehearsed and rendered without conscious difference of intention or manner. Their location in the service is fixed without reference to their inherent character, and often the people are not given the slightest hint in advance that their attitude toward them should be different.

An illustration will make this point clearer. The words, "God so loved the world that He gave His only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life; for

God sent not His Son into the world to condemn the world, but that the world through Him might be saved", are evidently didactic in essential character. They embody a supreme truth that is meant for our apprehension and acceptance as recipients of the Gospel message. This truth is the basis of faith and of worship, but it is not itself an utterance of worship. It has been the text of countless sermons, and will ever be the sum and substance of preaching through all the ages. But these words may be proclaimed in other ways than as a part of a Bible-reading or in a sermon. They have been set to music with consummate skill by more than one spiritually-minded composer, notably by the late Dr. Stainer, recently Professor of Music at Oxford. His beautiful setting, designed as one movement in his "Crucifixion", forms a typical anthem of the impressive class. It may be inserted in almost any service with propriety, because it announces a universal truth, always germane and timely. If properly sung, it is eminently fitted to teach, to admonish, to comfort, to uplift, to inspire those that listen. Its tonal form and exquisite workmanship give it a penetrating power that

mere speech rarely has or can have, and it breathes a general spirit that is a true commentary on its text and an enforcement of its lesson.*

Of anthems fitted in some way to fulfil this teaching and inspiring function there are many. Sometimes the two forms of utterance are dexterously mingled. There is a famous anthem of Sterndale Bennett of this composite structure. It opens with an extended treatment of the words, "Oh,

* As I write, there lies before me a letter from Dr. Stainer in which he discusses this very subject—the homiletic use of anthems—illustrating his thought by a rapid analysis of his well-known anthem, "I Desired Wisdom", closing with these words:—"This is practically a short sermon. But I am afraid that a vast number of those present in our churches do not realize that the words of an anthem should form the subject of *meditation* as it proceeds. I fear the art of silent meditation is gradually being lost owing to the over-estimation of so-called congregational worship. No one can be a greater champion of congregational worship than myself. But people are beginning to think that unless they are singing or saying something they are not worshipping. This notion cannot be protested against too strongly. By all means give the congregation all the responses and plenty of hymns, but teach them that there can be the highest form of worship in silent thought."

that I knew where I might find Him! that I might come even to His seat! Behold, I go forward, but He is not there, and backward, but I cannot perceive Him; on the left hand where He doth work, but I cannot behold Him; He hideth Himself on the right hand." The whole effect is that of the yearning, but baffled, groping of the soul for its highest satisfaction, and you think that the intention is to furnish an utterance of a certain kind of pathetic prayer. But suddenly, after having established this attitude in the listener's mind, the anthem changes to a second movement in strong contrast with the first, using these words, "Blessed are they that have not seen, but yet have believed", which are developed with an unexpected confidence and jubilant emphasis. The total effect is thus made to be strongly impressive and didactic, disclosing clearly the composer's real intention, and indicating the way in which the whole should be actually used. Of this composite type there are also many examples, particularly in those with more than one movement. Often the order of thought is reversed. A didactic utterance or a universal statement of supreme truth is put first, is

elaborated and pressed home; and then, upon this as a basis, is raised a superstructure of prayer and praise as the natural outcome of the truth at the bottom. In such cases the absolute classification of the whole anthem may be doubtful, since it may be used either expressively or impressively. But all such examples in some way illustrate my present point, which is that one of the great functions of choir music is to teach and to preach.

Without stopping to cite and analyze other examples, I wish here to register the conviction that in our churches generally this function of the choir should be far more emphasized than is common. It is not only legitimate and abundantly recognized by musical masters, but it is necessary to the fulfilment of music's practical mission as a handmaid of religion. Our churches exist and maintain regular services of all kinds largely, if not chiefly, for the preservation, proclamation and personal enforcement of revealed truth. They are bound to utilize every accredited and efficient agency for setting forth this truth and bringing it to bear on the hearts of men. For certain aspects of the Gospel message

no voice is more eloquent than that of music. By this, of course, I do not mean that singing is a proper medium for conveying a knowledge of mere facts, or for drawing nice logical distinctions, or for making homely applications of doctrine to duty, or for any other form of discourse that involves much intellectual detail. But I do mean that the more compact and precious summaries of the essence and kernel of God's messages to men that are scattered through the Bible often take on an unexpected freshness and lustre and penetrative energy when fitly clothed in melody and harmony. I mean that familiar words and thoughts whose repetition in mere speech sounds comparatively trite and formal often recover their meaning and their potency when lovingly uttered and reiterated through song. I mean that music has the power to invest such statements with an emotional exegesis and commentary and a tender intimacy of appeal that otherwise they may not have to the average mind.

This peculiar ministry of truth in tone is a unique privilege and opportunity for every choir—one that they themselves should prize and that the churches should be jeal-

ous to keep in its due place of honor. Special emphasis upon it is needed because it is singularly undervalued and neglected. Popular reference to choir music continually dwells upon it as a form of praise and prayer. So it is, but it may also be something more, a form of the most vigorous kind of preaching. This latter function should not drive out the other—there is no danger that it ever will—but it ought to be held in more general notice and esteem.

Among the many practical remarks that at once suggest themselves here we will select but one or two. Teaching and preaching anthems tend to be shorter and simpler in musical structure than anthems of praise. Their effectiveness depends primarily on the words, and these require somewhat direct presentation through obvious melody and plain harmony, without much polyphonic elaboration or obtrusive accompaniment. Accordingly, such anthems are technically easier for the singer to master and for the hearer instantly to appreciate; and so they may often be made very effective in conditions that are not favorable for some of the grander and more ornate styles of music. They are often within the reach

of many a humble parish, whose musical apparatus is limited. Many times the mere use of a didactic or hortatory hymn, set to a simple tune, or of the most ordinary chant or sentence, is better than any more intricate selection.

It is in the presentation of words whose content is more impressive than expressive that solo, duet and quartette singing is most valuable. What the hearer needs is to feel the impress of the singer's personality, so that the language used may be translated into terms of life; and personality is most obvious when the singers are few. In praise and prayer anthems, which are offered on behalf of the congregation, the chorus is the most typical and representative form of choir, since in it individuals are blended into a massive company; but in anthems of impression the reverse is usually true. Unfortunately, too many of our American composers, who have written so constantly and carefully for soloists and for the quartette, have failed to grasp this great distinction, and so have sometimes labored to force these slender types of choir music into a field where they are not fully at home or fully satisfactory. The danger of lapsing

into the concertistic style is certainly greater when a practiced singer is called upon to give voice to the generalities of adoration or thanksgiving or even of supplication, especially when expressed through music of decided intricacy, than when he is set to declare and urge some pointed statement of God's love or holiness or some pregnant word of Christ or of the apostolic teachers. In the latter class of cases the mere instinct of dramatic fitness is usually sufficient to prevent serious error or folly.

In insisting as I have upon this important distinction between expressive and impressive anthems, I do not for a moment forget that in any given case it cannot be absolutely maintained. But this is no more true in musical exercises than in all analogous spoken exercises. Every expressive exercise has an impressive value. Every prayer, for example, serves as virtually a sermon to every listener whose own spirituality lags behind that of the one who offers the prayer. And so every fine hymn or anthem of direct worship at the same moment that it goes up as a tribute to God is also a teaching of what worship ought to be and a call to every

listener to make his own worship nobler. And conversely, every impressive exercise has its expressive side. Even Bible-readings and sermons, in addition to their obvious didactic force, may be considered by the minister himself or adopted by the hearer as virtually statements of what he believes or aspires after, so that for him they are partly sent up to God as a sort of creed or covenant, a symbolic declaration or protestation of faith and zeal. And so every impressive anthem may be similarly employed in a double sense, being both communicated as teaching and at the same moment chosen as a symbol of faith. These entanglements of spiritual activity in public worship are exceedingly intricate, so that the same exercise actually has different values to different persons or when set in different conditions. In consequence, there is a temptation to think that this whole question of the exact significance of choir music is hopelessly complicated, baffling investigation and eluding definition.

But rational reflection shows that the matter is not as obscure as it is often made out to be. The great majority of anthem-texts certainly do belong wholly to the ex-

pressive or the impressive class, or, if compound, use one sort of utterance as a feeder or background for the other, so that the whole may be assigned definitely in one way or the other. Even in cases where the ideal assignment is debatable, the actual use of the anthem may yet be positively directed according to the desire of the leader by means of a word or two of preface. It really seems as if the main reason why anthems have been so helplessly regarded by many ministers and congregations, as well as by singers themselves, is simple thoughtlessness. The trouble is not with the subject, but with those who fail to put their minds into the study of it. To many people it is an unheard-of thing to sit down soberly to analyze an anthem-text for the sake of finding out what is in it, what it means, and at what it aims. Yet this is just what every reputable composer does before he undertakes his musical work upon it, so that every important anthem is the direct outgrowth of some sort of genuine intellectuality and serious spiritual intention. In justice to these products of careful thought and warm feeling, we have no right to toss them about as if they were empty

and flimsy bagatelles. In justice to ourselves, we have no right to stultify our powers of perception by a stupid disregard of the clear characteristics and qualities of what is laid before them. And in justice to the institution of public worship, we have no right to allow any part of it to be administered in a way to indicate either a heartless indifference or sheer mental incapacity. Whatever part of the common perplexity over the matter proves to be due to intellectual laziness probably merits nothing but hearty contempt. Perhaps half of the vagueness and feebleness of popular conceptions of choir music would vanish if only attention could be drawn to this cardinal point of the importance of the words employed in such music, regarded both as utterances of spiritual truth in general and as formulæ to be associated with others in the practical economy of public worship.*

This whole subject of the intellectual meaning and the moral intent of choir music merits special consideration in connection

* I have discussed this subject still more in detail in an article on "The Words of Choir Pieces" in the *Hartford Seminary Record* for Nov., 1900.

with the handling of the second service on Sunday. It is now common to set music, particularly choir music, in peculiar prominence in that service. There can be no objection to this, if only the music be so selected, so rendered and so regarded as to magnify its utilities both as a method of devotion and as a means of conveying evangelical inspiration. Choral services, in which the burden of vocal action falls on both congregation and choir, have a clear right to be, provided that they be controlled by rational wisdom and a definite spiritual purpose. The main objections to them, as frequently conducted, are that they lack unity, symmetry and point, and even seem sometimes to be animated by unworthy motives. Not enough time and thought are expended by the leaders upon their plan of action, on the aim and strategy of their campaign. Exercises are jumbled together without connection, without dramatic power, and, above all, without any visible or tangible religious fruitfulness. In too many cases the people are led to regard such services merely as a free entertainment, mercifully provided at a time when other recreations are interdicted, something

to enjoy for its æsthetic satisfactions merely or to carp at and criticize like any secular spectacle, something whose success is considered proportional to the size of the crowd it draws and the commotion it makes in the community. The reaction upon the choir is often unfortunate, causing them to aspire after merely sensational achievements and perhaps perverting the whole notion of their work. In consequence, cases occur in which the minister and his more thoughtful coadjutors are perplexed and harassed, not seeing how to avoid yielding to a drift of popular desire that seems hostile to the best interests of the church.

Such services need to be studied more carefully. They certainly have an important use, and yet they are open to abuse. Safeguards and rectifications are possible only through the personal oversight of the minister, working through the organist or choirmaster, upon all the details and their adjustment to each other. Sometimes unity is best secured by having a single, definite topic of thought around which all exercises shall gather and which they shall together expound and illustrate. Particularly serviceable sometimes are the musical cantatas

that are now moderately numerous, and which utilize the distinct value of a dramatic programme and its artistic development. Sometimes a center of thought may be best provided in a brief address, designedly different in style from a sermon, to which all other exercises are subordinated. Sometimes excellent results come from using some one of the many responsive services that are now accessible, in which the activity of the congregation in both speech and song is made prominent. But fundamental to success in the highest sense with any of these methods, particularly on their musical sides, is the emphasis in the minds of all participants of a spiritual desire and a spiritual purpose. This will be secured only through elaborate care on the minister's part beforehand and through his direct control over the administration of the whole service. In such services, much more than in the more stately morning service, it is often wise to comment on the words of anthems, bringing out their latent significance and stimulating by suggestion the right attitude of congregational attention to them. Here is a chance to mark with clearness the lines of kinship between con-

gregational music and choir music, or between choir music and the ministerial functions of prayer and preaching. Here is one of the best opportunities to arouse a fruitful interest in hymnody, in sacred music in general, and in the distinctively religious power of the church musician. So far from being an evil, then, such second services may in such ways be made intensely stimulating, may be turned to the manifest benefit of all other services, may nourish the immature and pointless spirituality of both young and old into something decided and strong, and may draw many an outsider within the circle of believers in the Gospel and workers in the Kingdom.

It will doubtless be objected that throughout this chapter we have been laying emphasis too exclusively on what may be called the theory of the choir. We have been trying, as we suggested at the outset, to see what the choir can do and ought to do. In all this it may have seemed that we were shutting our eyes to certain practical obstacles in the way, and especially as if we were unmindful of the large personal equation in the problem. The plan of treat-

ment, however, was chosen deliberately. The chief cause of trouble about the choir is that its field and its aims are too vaguely defined in the minds of its members, its managers, and the public at large. Whether the particular views here presented fully commend themselves or not, it is only by means of some similar process of logical deduction that we can hope to plant our choir music on solid and worthy foundations. In default of some definite basis of principles, we shall find ourselves swayed hither and thither by chance impulses, bewildered by conflicting currents of hasty opinion, and occasionally swept completely off our feet. Happily for the general welfare of the subject, in all of our churches and among most musicians there is a far greater readiness for sound opinions than some good people suppose. In this field, as in others, we may be sure that there is everywhere a large amount of diffused, latent commonsense and right feeling to which we may confidently appeal.

One of the interesting evidences of the existence of good instincts in the popular mind is the gradual improvement that has undoubtedly taken place in the personal fit-

ness of choir singers during the last few decades. Forty years ago our churches were far less careful than now about the character of those to whom they entrusted their musical work, employing freely not only non-Christians, but persons of notoriously evil lives. There has been a steady reaction from this folly. In 1887 I made an extensive inquiry among over 1,500 Congregational and Presbyterian churches in all parts of the country as to such aspects of their musical arrangements as could be statistically stated. One of the inquiries concerned the proportion of choir singers who were church members. Over 900 choirs were reported, in which it appeared that of some 1,200 quartette singers 68 per cent. were church members, and of over 9,000 other choir singers 76 per cent.* These

* Among quartette choirs in the larger churches one out of every four was wholly made up of church members, and in the smaller churches one out of every three. Curious facts regarding choirs of all kinds as to this matter of church membership were that the churches of the Interior made a distinctly better showing than those of New England, and that the Presbyterian churches had a considerable advantage over the Congregational. See the detailed publication of the results in *The Christian Union,* Nov. and Dec., 1888.

statistics are now several years old. Probably if a similar inquiry were now instituted, the figures would show decided gains all along the line.

This particular test is of course not completely satisfactory, though perhaps as close as mere statistics can be pushed. The critical question about choir singers is as to their general mental and spiritual fitness for their work. If they are to lead and represent the congregation in worship, and much more if they are to minister to the spiritual benefit of the congregation, they must have some real experience of and sympathy with religious truth, and the total impression of their personality must be consonant with the services they essay to render. In chorus choirs there is no serious objection to utilizing the voices of those who because of youth may not be ready to make a public profession of faith, and even among quartette and solo singers perhaps a similar latitude may be allowed. In many cases the duty of choir singing has led to an increased interest and thoughtfulness. But it may be doubted whether any church can afford to employ as an official ministrant any man or woman, however artistically gifted, who is

known to be out of sympathy with Christian things or whose daily life will not bear scrutiny.

There are a number of other most important matters relating to the personal side of choir management that must be considered, but they are here omitted because they will come up later in connection with the duties of the choir leader. In conclusion here, let us simply dwell for a moment upon one very obvious piece of good judgment and good manners that is too often neglected. The service of singing in a choir is sometimes made peculiarly hard and thankless by the strange attitude taken toward the singers by members of the congregation. The duty of the singer is not easy from any point of view, and we surely owe it to those who undertake it with sincerity of purpose to give them the help of cordial good-will, of steady and friendly appreciation, and of courteously avoiding needless criticism. Musical people are necessarily sensitive. They cannot be good musicians without having quick and warm feelings. Their art requires the expenditure of no small amount of the choicest energies of mind and heart. They often put

into what seems spontaneous and almost unconscious a wealth of desire and fervor that others cannot begin to understand. Every true singer must utter something of his inmost self in every phrase he sings, even when he knows that all the conditions of his utterance are unfavorable and even when he is hampered by real difficulties of utterance within himself. It is for those who listen to acknowledge the high quality of self-sacrifice that inheres in this sort of effort, to afford every possible assistance in their power, and to render gratitude and honor where they are due. The work of a choir is an exalted and holy work, but it can never be made ideally joyful or thoroughly fruitful unless it be set round on every side by an atmosphere of hearty Christian kindness, responsiveness and affection.

THE ORGAN *and* THE ORGANIST

We have already noted that the organ has always been recognized in the Christian Church as the sacred instrument *par excellence.* Though its bare principle seems to have been known before the Christian era, and though it was first used only as an item of heathen luxury, it was brought over into the mediæval world and there steadily developed from a plaything into a noble implement entirely by those interested in Christian worship. Its altogether unique utility for accompanying choral song, even in the largest buildings, and the essential dignity and grandeur of its tonal effects, have always been sufficient reasons for its striking prominence in religious services. It is a curious question how different the whole liturgical unfolding of Christianity might have been if the organ had not been available from very early times. Certainly the whole growth of the art of music in the Middle Ages would have been decidedly other than it was.

If this were a technical treatise, it would be interesting and profitable to dwell at length upon the structure of the modern

organ as a consummate product of genius and skill zealously and lovingly at work through a series of centuries. From a crude simplicity the organ has been gradually built up into the most elaborate and intricate of all our musical instruments. Even a small example to-day represents an extraordinary amount of mechanical ingenuity, and achieves its success because of the patient toil of generations of experimenters. The details of organ construction are somewhat strangely unknown even to intelligent and wide-awake people, and the marvel of its workable unity in spite of its hundreds and thousands of separate parts is usually quite unappreciated. The discussion of these mechanical details, if space permitted, would really be pertinent here, since most churches have pipe organs or mean to have them, and are therefore confronted by practical questions about buying them, or keeping them in order, or providing for their proper use. Wider popular knowledge would surely prevent many foolish outlays of money and some disastrous mistakes. Wider knowledge, too, would bring a higher valuation of what an educated organist knows and does, and would tend to raise

and rectify the standards of criticism of him and his work in many ways. The making of a good church organ is a triumph of high art, and the effective handling of such an organ is one of the most noble achievements of advanced musicianship; and it would be eminently worth while if more persons in our churches could be led to recognize the inherent dignity of everything that pertains to this wonderful instrument and its use.

But for these and other related topics we have here no room. We must turn at once to look at the relation of pure organ music to our church services. Custom has settled it that if the organ is to be used by itself, it shall be for preludes and postludes, and sometimes, also, for interludes between verbal exercises or while such non-verbal ones as the collection are in progress. The question at once presents itself, What is such organ music for? or, What should we expect it to accomplish? This involves some further inquiry about the potency of all instrumental music as compared with that of vocal music. This latter question, of course, can be considered only in the

most casual way, since it is really one of the most intricate of musical æsthetics.

While it must be conceded that all instrumental music is intellectually indefinite in that it does not present clear images or definable concepts to the mind, there can be no doubt that such music has in most cases much power of suggestion to the imagination and the associative faculties and so is capable of decided emotional and moral values. Much depends on the breadth of the listener's musical experience and on various circumstances of the act of hearing. But even those who listen without decided critical understanding and attention are often conscious that music without words exerts a decided influence on their general mood, on the currents and tone of their thoughts, on the degree of their emotional susceptibility, and even on the general trend of their moral impulses. Illustrations might be cited from a wide variety of social conditions and occasions, secular as well as sacred. Surely, if this is true anywhere, it is likely to be true within a sacred building, in an assembly gathered ostensibly for a religious service, under the impress of the manifold associations, memories and tradi-

tions that cluster around the place, the time, the act and the social organization of the Church, all of which point irresistibly towards spiritual sentiments and aspirations. It is not unlikely, too, that many of the peculiar tonal effects that are producible from the pipe organ have some special potency in evoking and stimulating religious feelings. Whether or not this be so, we may safely assume that it is both possible and probable that pure organ music as a part of religious services will have a decided impressive value under the conditions of its ordinary use. It is on this assumption that such music has become a recognized factor in our services.

The organ prelude is the most important device by which it is sought to turn this value to liturgical account. The congregation as it comes together is made up of various classes—young and old, rich and poor, happy and sorrowful, serious and heedless. Every experienced public speaker is profoundly aware of the exceeding heterogeneity and the comparative inertia of such an assembly. The first great needs are some degree of emotional unity and the establishment of some mental momentum in the

congregation as a whole. Among the many possible means to these ends, the organ prelude is certainly one of the most universally useful. To do its work, it needs to have enough obvious tonal beauty and strength both to command general attention and to attract sympathetic delight. It should be positive and confident enough in technical presentation to exert a kind of magnetic control over the listener, whether or not he is able to follow it in detail with a connoisseur's interest. And obviously it should have such a character as to help those who hear towards a healthy and hearty elevation of spirit, towards a state of mind where the offering of worship is easy and where the receiving of spiritual instruction and guidance is welcome.

It is doubtful whether the exact style of prelude that shall do these things can be defined with any exactness. I rather believe that many useful styles are possible, varying with the player, with the congregation, and with the occasion. But a few practical points may be suggested. The length of the usual prelude should be between four and eight or ten minutes. Its style should rarely be so ornate or florid as

to attract special attention to the player's dexterity or the composer's ingenuity. It should be more emotional than learned, more sweet and solemn than fanciful or merely pretty, more meditative than boisterous and loud, more noble than amazing. Its themes and harmonies and rhythms should be kept from anything that would recall the mere popular concert or the theater. Usually it should be something written for the organ and for church use rather than an adaptation from other musical literature. Its technical presentation should not be contrived so as to show off either the player's versatility or the resources of the instrument, except as mere incidents. All these things are obvious.

But something more needs to be said. The prelude, like every dignified piece of instrumental music, is not only a thing, but an expression. It is a means whereby the organist, following in the track of the composer, can bring himself to bear upon the congregation. His general character is probably more or less known, but in his preludes he has an exceptional chance again and again to declare himself somewhat intimately and to join the force of his person-

ality to the other personal forces of public worship. For every earnest organist, whatever be his artistic capacity, this truly ministerial function may be a great and inspiring one. One has but to know organists to find that into the fulfilment of this week after week often goes a wholly incalculable amount of the choicest desire and intention. And even those who are not conscious of such high purposes realize that they are not without obligation to keep them in sight.

It is nothing less than shameful how often both ministers and congregations hamper or defeat these efforts at self-expression by their habitual treatment of them. The prelude usually receives but scant courtesy, if not actual disdain. The minister is fussily busy over his little preparations in the pulpit or outside. Many of the people are still straggling in, settling themselves and their wraps, perhaps talking more or less. Oftentimes the air is full of the noise of movement and evident inattention, so that neither the player nor those who are minded to listen are given the help of even passable decorum. Thus, instead of recognizing the prelude as a personal utterance, the notion is fostered that it is

something wholly outside the service proper, a piece of sumptuary elegance, or an empty and senseless foolishness. The same things may be said even more bitterly about the postlude, that musical meditation or commentary at the end of the service which practically universal customs of discourtesy have reduced to a condition of utter and disgraceful uselessness in ways that need no description.

These things ought not so to be. Either the prelude and the postlude are significant because they are personal utterances and personal appeals, or they are not worth an organist's working upon or worth counting as parts of public worship. Either they should be treated fairly or given up. I am well aware of the objections that may be lodged against the way in which certain organists themselves have debased these exercises—objections that surely have sufficient provocation—but, after allowing for such cases, it must be said that here, as so often in the whole system of our church music, a special stress of blame for unworthy habits and standards of action falls on ministers and congregations. They have too frequently made it clear that they

do not respect and do not care to learn to respect these instrumental exercises in their own services. And yet they have the presumption to ask a self-respecting organist to supply Sunday after Sunday what they thus make of no account. In the presence of facts like these, it need not seem strange that sometimes high-minded musicians are forced to say with genuine regret that they do not care to have anything to do with the practical handling of church music in some of our churches.

It would be well if we could linger much longer on this particular branch of our subject, especially to advocate the greater use of the organ in the midst of services wherever organ music is honored. I believe that there is a peculiar utility in many churches in introducing brief instrumental interludes or connectives between certain exercises and at prominent turning-points in the service. We Americans tend to be too breathless in our public worship. We scramble along from one exercise to the next too anxiously, and give too little space for moments of quiet meditation and self-adjustment. Intervals of absolute silence are perhaps not advisable,

but intervals of abstinence from speech under the sway of pervasive organ tones may be made more efficient than is generally appreciated. But, of course, this special use of the organ is only practicable where the organist is competent and all the other personal circumstances are conducive. It is only right, however, to speak this one word about it before passing on to the larger matters that still lie before us.

I imagine that the impression left by most general discussions of church music is one of unpracticalness. It is felt that such principles and ideals, for example, as have been advocated in these pages, are well enough as theories, but are so far away from what can usually be accomplished in actual parish conditions that they are hardly useful. This scepticism is natural, and is favored by various well-known facts. It is all very fine, someone will say, to hold exalted notions about the general historic relations between religion and music and about the influence of tone-works upon spirituality; but plain people cannot take hold of such transcendental notions. It is proper enough to emphasize hymns and hymn-

singing in the abstract as avenues for congregational praise and prayer; but hymn-singing in the concrete shows an inevitable tendency to deteriorate and become devitalized, in spite of all efforts to keep up its standard. It may be well to magnify the office of choir music as an ideal means of awakening religious feeling, of preaching truth, of stimulating worship; but, after all, most choir singers are quite unfit to exercise these high functions and most congregations rapidly grow weary of too urgent and serious a policy of choir music. Here is one church that simply cannot afford the monetary outlay needed to support a good form of music. There is another where the personal relations of the matter are so delicate that it is inexpedient to institute any thorough reform. So it seems as if every point that may be presented as desirable proves in experience to be unattainable in most cases, or at least beset by multiform difficulties. Occasionally, therefore, the whole subject is cast aside by practical church workers as unpromising and wearisome, if not absolutely hopeless.

The practical difficulties are not to be minimized. They are real, and sometimes are

locally or temporarily insurmountable. But this is equally true of every other branch of religious work. And here, just as in other matters, the true position for thoughtful people who dominate church action is not that of helpless and cowardly retreat, but of study and of patient, tactful effort in the directions that study shows to be important. Since the details of musical management are so largely technical, the question of official leadership in it takes on a supreme importance. Indeed, here is the strategic center of the whole matter. The responsibility for the conduct of the musical department in every church is bound to fall on one or two persons, and in the long run it will be what these persons make it. These persons are plainly the organist (or other musical director) and the minister. For them there is here a great duty and a great privilege. In the present chapter we will consider only the former, leaving the functions of the latter for separate treatment.

For convenience I shall use the title "organist" for the official who personally manages the music, though statistics show that

more of our churches lodge this responsibility in the hands of a choirmaster or chorister. Someone must be chief in the department of musical work. Theoretically there are manifest advantages in making this the organist, but the scarcity of persons able both to exercise general management and to play the organ, and the danger of somewhat frequent changes of player, have led from two-thirds to three-quarters of our churches to make the choir leader supreme. This variation of usage is not specially significant, except as it testifies to a popular instinct in favor of entrusting the music to the care of some suitable and comparatively permanent officer.

Be this as it may, the first practical remark that presents itself is that the choice of this officer should be vested in the church itself, not in its accessory financial organization—what Congregationalists call "the society". The musical leader is an assistant pastor. All his functions are parts of the general pastoral function. They are all features of the administration of public worship as a church exercise. Hence to leave his selection and the formal control of his work to any mere business body or to a

committee thereof is preposterous. His salary, of course, must be fixed and paid in the ordinary business way, but his work should derive its warrant from the church proper.*

The mere formality of having the musical leader elected by the church or by the session will amount to little by itself. All the parties in interest must learn to proceed with a clear recognition that the appointee is to be virtually a pastoral assistant. Certainly the pastor and the musical leader must manage somehow to get together in sympathy and effort. It not only means much trying friction and discomfort when these two church officers do not understand each other or stand in antagonism, but it positively prevents the proper working of all the liturgical machinery. Each may have to make concessions as to opinions and tastes, and both may have to take care lest occasions of stumbling come, but something

* In this matter the West is better off than the East. In the larger churches of New England the music is managed by "the society" in about nine out of ten cases, while in the Interior among Congregational churches the ratio is only about five out of ten, and among Presbyterian churches less than three out of ten. The smaller churches in all cases show better ratios than these.

is radically wrong when they cannot strike hands cordially on fundamental purposes and desires. Certainly, also, the office of musical leader would less often be assumed lightly and unadvisedly, or be cheaply regarded by congregations, if its essentially pastoral character and its organic connection with the work of the pastor-in-chief were more widely considered. It is curious that while this principle is assumed as a matter of course in churches like the Roman Catholic and the Episcopalian (usually), it is still not fully accepted and adopted in other denominations. Peace and prosperity in the musical department are hardly possible until the principle is frankly admitted as a basis of action everywhere.

Having said this, we do not need to spend time in insisting on the importance of a clean personal character and of definite religious consecration on the leader's part. These things are too obvious to require argument or exposition. But it is in order to refer briefly to some of the other things to be desired in a musical leader.

It may draw forth a smile if we venture to urge that a musical leader needs to know something about music. Yet there are

leaders who can play or sing very fairly who are yet not even fair musicians. I mean, of course, that they know little of music as a general art, little of its literature or its history or its theory or its diversified styles and their applications, particularly as all these have to do with church music. There is no patent process whereby the presence or absence of such knowledge can be ascertained in any given case, or whereby its lack can be readily supplied. The difficulty that confronts the churches here originates in a prevalent low standard of musical professionalism and the narrowness of what is called musical education. Church music is bound to suffer from whatever keeps down the tone of musicianship in general. But musical standards are being steadily raised among us, thanks to the good work of certain of our educational institutions. The churches should be wide awake to utilize this progress for their own purposes. In the long run, it is surely better to seek musical leaders who are broadly intelligent about their art than those who are merely clever in doing things with their fingers or their vocal cords. Church music needs competent knowledge far more than flashy brilliance

of execution or even what is called a pronounced musical "temperament".

In Europe, I believe, women organists are very rare. With us they are common, in the West and in the smaller churches decidedly outnumbering the men. To me this seems most fortunate. The truth is that in many most important ways women average much better than men. As responsible workers in the field of church music, they have capacities of sentiment, enthusiasm, fidelity and high spirituality that are of inestimable value. It is true that as concert organists they seldom reach the highest technical rank and that they lack the originality and impulse to be composers, but these are just the things least needed in the rank and file of musical leaders in the churches. It is true, also, that they do not always succeed as choir managers, though this can hardly be due to real inability so much as to insufficient training or the lack of a proper incentive. Possibly one or two other drawbacks might be mentioned. But in spite of all these, I am inclined to think that our American churches have shown a true instinct in so often selecting women to administer their music, and that as time goes

on their prominence in this honorable and useful branch of the musical profession will increase. If only the churches will take the pains to make the position of musical leader suitable for a self-respecting candidate, able young women will more and more be drawn to prepare themselves adequately for this service, and may be expected to do even more than they already have to further its best interests as a branch of Christian work.

Whoever undertakes this duty of leadership, and whether he acts as organist or as choirmaster, he is sure to find the detail of choir management difficult. The securing of singers is one problem. The selection of music for them to sing is another. The preparation and rendition of this music is a third. And the maintenance of generally pleasant personal relations between members of the choir and between them and the people is also plainly necessary. We can here only register rapidly a few opinions on each of these practical points.

As to the formation of a choir, the ideal seems to be a chorus of sixteen voices or more, including either one or two soloists, or, better yet, a fairly well-balanced quar-

tette. Something less than this is often all that is practicable, and may prove highly satisfactory. The force needed depends on the amount and style of the music that it seems wise to attempt. On the whole, the purely voluntary choir proves to be difficult to maintain, though there are notable exceptions.* Personally, I think that a system of small salaries to all the singers is a good one, since it formally recognizes the large sacrifice of time and strength required, and makes regularity of attendance and diligence of service a matter of business obligation. The selection and engagement of singers should be wholly in the leader's hands, subject only to the approval of the pastor.

As to the choice of music, two practical points are obvious. It must be suited to the capacity of the actual singers (as well as to the average taste of the people), and it must be suited to the needs of the actual services of the church as organized by the pastor. This latter adaptation is much more delicate

* One of the best choirs I know consists of about forty persons, of whom only one receives a salary; and yet for years they have enthusiastically maintained two full rehearsals a week.

a problem than leaders are apt to realize. They too often exalt either purely musical features or a low sort of popular effectiveness at the expense of strict liturgical fitness. They content themselves with searching for merely pretty music, or music that shows off voices or that astonishes the hearer, forgetting that no church music is successful that is not made to harmonize perfectly with its surroundings in actual services. Far more attention should be put upon the words of anthems than is the rule, letting the choice be determined primarily by them, and bringing impressive and instructive texts much more to the front. As far as possible, the selection of all choir music should be a matter of consultation between the leader and the minister, so that each may keep in close touch with the other and that both together may contrive services that shall have genuine unity of spirit and method. Such consultation must be so timed as to give adequate chance for rehearsal.

This not being a technical handbook, we pass by the questions of just what forms of musical structure are to be sought in anthems, and of the technical drill of a choir—

both of which are evidently important, but difficult to discuss profitably without taking much space. Suffice it here to remark concerning the latter that as choir music is performed under peculiarly trying conditions, it requires peculiarly careful preparation. Like all public music, it needs to be correct and tasteful in execution, but it needs in addition a somewhat special perfection and winsomeness of style, as well as a fairly definite moral purpose. Choir rehearsals, therefore, should be exceptionally thorough technically, and exceptionally thoughtful and earnest besides. If church music be a means to an end, surely the end should be clear in the minds of the choir. Through every available method the leader should endeavor to stimulate enthusiasm among his singers for their work, aiming to keep its dignity unimpaired and to rouse every worthy ambition in it.

Beyond all these multifarious details of choir management, the office of musical leader carries with it a further duty of general congregational influence. There is much to be said for the view that the organist or other musical director should serve in the Sunday-school and at all the prayer-

meetings as well as at the formal Sunday services. At least all services should have a uniform musical policy and manner, and the people should learn to depend on their musical chief as a central source of authority and inspiration. The Sunday-school service, as has already been said, merits especial attention musically, since it is the liturgical training-school for the church of the future. Sometimes considerable popular good is done by organ-recitals, choir concerts and other strictly artistic performances of music, though these all require some care lest they foster false standards regarding service music. Still more valuable in many cases are special classes for singing and the rudiments of musical science both for young and old. The idea of the old-fashioned singing-school is not without suggestion for to-day. Once in a while a leader is found who is able to do more than this—to give instructive lectures on topics pertaining to his department, and even to conduct such meetings of the church as may be devoted to this matter. Fortunate is the church whose pastor's musical assistant has the mental equipment and the personal gifts in these and similar ways to

work himself thoroughly into the entire fabric of its life, identifying himself cordially with all its activities, coming into relations of friendship and esteem among all its members, and thus making himself a power in the whole parish. Probably no one advance in our church music is more to be desired than that our churches generally should place such value upon the post of musical leader as to attract into it and hold in it men and women of such ability and character as to ensure in return this kind of strong, diffused and efficient personal influence.

THE MINISTER'S RESPONSIBILITY

WHATEVER system of thought or mechanism of administration be chosen for the music of any given church, the personal factors in the problem will never be eliminated—indeed, never displaced from a controlling position. The solutions reached will depend partly upon the attitude taken by the people generally and by the various individuals associated together in the details of the musical work. Much more will they depend on the ability, the enthusiasm and tact, and the spirit and purpose of the musical leader. And we cannot stop here. In the last analysis the thorough success of musical parish work is impossible without somewhat positive qualities in the minister and in his habits of thought and action. In the musical department, as in others, the minister is formally commander-in-chief, and his technical headship must be confirmed by his being actually the central authority and the fountain-head of right ideas, dominating impulses, and wise plans of action. From him will radiate, whether he wills it or not, a pervasive influence that shall either invigor-

ate or deaden all practical efficiency. To a brief consideration of his relation to the whole matter we must assuredly devote a few final pages. Our thoughts may be conveniently arranged under three heads, namely, the minister's duty to the various musical officials, his duty to his people in general, and his duty to himself and his office.

No argument is needed to show how important is a true fraternal sympathy between the pastor and the organist or choirmaster and the singers of the choir. Whether a state of sympathy exists is usually determined by the pastor's own action, except in cases where there is some manifest folly in the plan of organization adopted by the church itself independently of the pastor. Musical people are like others in being susceptible to kindliness and respectful consideration, to manly and noble intentions, to an intelligent and judicious policy, to genuine spiritual warmth. Indeed, their very artistic training makes them susceptible to these things in a peculiar degree. Instead, therefore, of treating them with timidity or suspicion or disdain, the pastor should assume that he may count on them

as hearty sympathizers in achieving whatsoever things are true, honorable, lovely and gracious. He should not only meet them half-way, but meet them with an indefeasible expectation of winning their esteem and loyalty. The basis of all successful cooperation is personal friendship, and this, I repeat, the pastor can nearly always establish if he will.

Upon this basis the minister is in position to exercise a certain general control over the musical life of the church. Usually he will be wise to avoid too much meddling with the petty details. He certainly should not interfere with the responsibility or authority of the leader. The best work of subordinate officers is always done when they feel themselves free to work out problems in their own way. Even when their ideas and impulses are not altogether good or wise, it is often well not to object or oppose, but to wait for the gradual supplanting of these through unconscious education. There is a wonderful power in the firm establishment in a church of a general liturgical atmosphere, in which the dignity of all services and all exercises is exalted, their beauty and artistic unity enhanced and

constantly illustrated, and their sincerity and heartiness made contagious. In such an atmosphere, which only the minister can set up and maintain, the musical workers will usually be prompt to shape all that they do so as to increase the harmony and symmetry of the total effect. One may reasonably wonder whether a large part of the supposed want of sympathy of musicians with religious work is not due to their instinctive recoil from the crude and even vulgar ways of speech and action that some ministers permit themselves to adopt. There are altogether too many violations of good taste and propriety that go along with what is thought to be Gospel earnestness—crudities of language, slovenliness of manners, habits of egotistic and domineering swagger, a rough disregard of all refined sensibilities. These things, alas, are not unknown among the heralds of Him who was meek and lowly, gentle and tender; and wherever they appear, and even where they are mistakenly imagined to exist, there is sure to be reaction and dislike. In all my acquaintance with musicians I cannot recall a single expression of opposition to the essence of religion, but only to the ways and

personality of those who represented it officially. The conduct of public worship in all its parts is a branch of the highest fine art, and sometimes the instinct of those who view it from the organ-bench or the choir-seats is far more delicate and true than that of him who occupies the pulpit.

Of course, the minister's cordiality to his musical assistants will show itself in the constant effort to understand their work from their point of view. He will try to follow their endeavors in detail, not so much as the supervisor of their work, as a partner with them in it. Without in any way interfering with the leader's freedom or supremacy in his own field, he will do well to make himself a welcome visitor at choir rehearsals. In such contacts he may impart much, but he will also receive much, especially in a broader knowledge of what music is and what its literature contains and what are its proper applications in the church. Even if his own musical training has been very defective, he will find that the same powers of mental analysis and assimilation that he uses in other subjects will serve him here. Through the process of frequent exchange of ideas with his mu-

sicians he will find that his hold upon them will be steadily strengthened and his power to incorporate their energy with his own will be increased. Thus, too, he will be saved from many a blunder and infelicity.

The minister's duty to his people generally concerning musical matters has many sides. As has already been sufficiently indicated, it lies chiefly along two lines, instruction and leadership. He needs to tell them what they do not know, to win them from narrowness and thoughtlessness into wider sympathies and better aspirations, and in all his references to church music and in all his practical use of it to be something of a model to them. In its every branch they will take the cue from him.

Usually the true place to begin is with the hymns and their tunes, both because hymns appeal to the general literary sense and touch religious life so obviously and at so many points, and because the singing of hymns is usually a congregational function. But the process of education should extend itself to choir music and organ music. In all these directions our congregations need much more explicit help than is commonly given them. Sometimes interest can be

stimulated by historical accounts of what church music has been in the past, how it has come to be what it is, and by what masters it has been specially built up. Sometimes good will be done by dwelling on its theory or philosophy or æsthetics. But more useful still are repeated efforts to give careful analyses of actual specimens, especially with the aid of vocal and instrumental illustration. Studies of particular authors or composers as known through their works, of particular styles or periods, of the varied treatments that have been given to particular themes or sentiments, or the use of special artistic devices—all these have the greatest value. Through them even people who suppose themselves to be unmusical may be shown just how the ordinary powers of the mind may be so focussed on musical subjects as to see them in a right perspective and with something of a just appreciation.

Whether or not the minister has the knowledge and the wit himself to utilize all these fine opportunities, he may surely encourage others to do it for him, and he must expect to lead his people by force of example to treat all their church music with respect and even with affection. He

will be careful never to imply indifference to it. He will be scrupulously particular about his outward demeanor before and during and after all musical exercises. He will not forget to mention in his prayers those who serve the church through song or instrument. He will see that in all announcements of services and in all printed statements of parish organization the place of the music and the musicians is properly indicated in coördination with the other activities of the church. He will not stand aloof from any effort put forth, even indirectly, to feed the musical life of the parish or of the community to which it belongs. Even if he be unable to do these things out of a strong inner enthusiasm, he will keep them before him as professional obligations and chances for professional effectiveness. For the benefit of his church services, of the spirit and momentum of his congregation's life, and of the state of religion among his people, these things are fully as important as many others that it is now customary to exploit loudly as indispensable parts of present-day ministerial enterprise. If downright work for the sake of parish music is not worth the time it takes, then nothing can

justify the extensive use of music that we make in our parishes.

If only some part of what has been said about these duties of the minister to his musical assistants and to his people be accepted as valid, it is clear that in this matter of sacred music the minister has urgent duties to himself. He cannot hope to act as inspirer and manager and teacher and model in a department where he is egregiously ignorant and helpless. It is pitiful to hear the incessant laments of active pastors over their incapacities on this side of their ministerial work. Some of these laments are based on what is believed to be an inherent native inability which is often imaginary. More of them relate to the lack of opportunities for self-culture in college and seminary, or to the sad failure to use the opportunities that existed. Some of them emphasize the undeniable stress of burdens in the active pastorate, which stand in the way of continued study and growth in more directions than one. These expressions of intense regret are so numerous as abundantly to justify all the urgency that I have been bold enough to embody in these pages. From the point of view of common pastoral

experience the subject is universally conceded to be momentous and critical. And so it is imperative that among candidates for the ministry it should be fully considered as it affects them in their preparatory studies.

It is often said that it is most desirable that all theological students should learn to sing. Of course it is, just as it is that they should learn to speak. The two vocal processes have the most vital interrelation, and both have an evident connection with future success. Training in both should properly begin in the common school, be continued in college, and be specialized in the seminary. It is needed for physiological soundness, for provision against the terrific vocal strain of ministerial life, for the nurture of all the expressional activities of the mind, and for the uncovering of many a latent capacity of the heart and the spirit. The mastery of musical rudiments through song is as much a part of general education as many others of the tools of culture, and the personal readiness thus acquired has innumerable applications in the daily routine of the active pastor. For most persons singing is the best gateway whereby to enter upon a

personal acquaintance with the manifold riches of the tone-world.

But, while giving all due importance to this technical line of study, it is a grave mistake to exalt this as the only or the chief desideratum in the preparatory equipment of the minister for his musical responsibilities. Singing is an art of no small magnitude. All that most theological students can do with it, unless they have had much experience beforehand, is to take the first steps in it. The further they can go, the better; but if they are able to get but a little way in it, they should not suppose for a moment that they are thereby debarred from attacking in other ways and much more elaborately many other really more profitable lines of study.

In all its social applications the art of music suffers sadly from the positive ignorance of those who would use it. I do not mean technical ignorance, but ignorance of those general facts and truths that are a part of general culture. Church music is an excellent illustration of this. Whether or not ministers sing or play, they ought to see that the great thing for them is to know well those larger aspects of the subject that most

people do not know in any useful way. To this end there is every reason for a musical department in theological seminaries to teach those aspects as fully as students can and will follow them out. For instance, a seminary may wisely offer opportunities for training in harmonic construction and analysis to as many as have the aptitude to pursue them. Much of such work may be shaped so as to be accessible to those otherwise lacking in musical experience. Still more valuable in many cases are courses of a demonstrative character, in which illustrations are presented upon the piano or organ, if not vocally, of representative church music, both hymn-tunes and anthems, and of oratorio music. It is almost touching to see how even a little of such work bears fruit in a new sense of music's capacity for embodying and illuminating religious thought and in a desire to go further in an acquaintance with its multifarious literature. The general history of music is also a most profitable subject for seminary treatment, especially if conducted so as to lay emphasis upon the interlocking of music with the other fine arts and with the progress of culture. Much of this, too, can be turned di-

rectly to account for the work of the practical ministry. In connection with such courses seminary students are to be congratulated if they also have some chances to hear good music of any kind, secular as well as sacred, instrumental as well as vocal, so as to awaken their artistic natures and to familiarize them with music's ways of expression and with some of its typical masterpieces. If students can join in the work of a good choral society they will find the results of lasting benefit. Time spent in such self-culture may prove to be of life-long profit and utility, quite aside from the immediate mental refreshment and æsthetic delight that they provide.

Still more imperative and universally practical than such comparatively technical courses as these are systematic and thorough investigations into the history and criticism of Hymnody and into the history and principles of Public Worship. Neither of these requires any strictly musical knowledge whatever. Both, however, have directly to do with the proper ministerial management of music, in addition to their other manifest utilities. We have already said something upon the matter of Hymnody. Let us here

add a few words about the minute study of the problem of Public Worship. This is especially incumbent upon those who are to work among the churches of our order, since with us the lack of a fixed liturgy and of settled traditions of liturgical practice leaves us peculiarly at the mercy of the fancy and caprice of our ministers. They have to construct a liturgy afresh at every service, and if they be without the requisite knowledge, wisdom or taste, the results are apt to be painful and harmful. We may not place much dependence on mere rules of procedure, and certainly need not wish for the adoption of any uniform ritual, but we may yet hold strenuously to the importance of an extensive knowledge of what public worship has been in the Christian Church and of the basic principles that should always underlie it. The well-wisher for the cause of church music among us can hardly ask for anything more serviceable than that every minister might be aroused to the splendid richness of both Hymnody and general Liturgics as fields for personal and pastoral cultivation.

All these subjects may be presented in the seminary through lectures and other ordi-

nary methods of instruction so as to find their place side by side with every other topic in the curriculum; and it is extraordinary that more of our seminaries have not set them in their place before now. Most of them, also, may be fairly pursued through the private reading of standard books. For example, as regards Church Music in general, its history, principles and practical management, every pastor ought to own such manuals as Curwen's fascinating "Studies in Worship-Music", or Edwards' "Church Praise", or Daniels' "Chapters on Church Music". Similarly, as regards Hymnody, no pastor's library can afford to omit such books as Horder's "Hymn-Lover", or Saunders' "Evenings with the Sacred Poets", or Duffield's "English Hymns" and "Latin Hymns", or Welsh and Edwards' "Romance of Psalter and Hymnal",—even if it may not include so magnificent a compendium of information as Julian's monumental "Dictionary of Hymnology". On the history and theory of Public Worship there is no entirely satisfactory handbook available in English, though Richard and Painter's excellent book called "Christian Worship" and the

series of lectures given at Union Seminary in 1896 and published under the same title are both full of instruction and suggestion.* In all these directions the earnest student will find his thought led on by means of such volumes into many a path of special investigation and delightful inquiry. Each branch of the subject offers matter for years of patient consideration. Indeed, not even the brightest mind can hope to do much that is worth while with them except by repeated returns to them as maturity advances and experience widens.

Even a little of such study ought to be sufficient to demonstrate two points—which it will be seen have been constantly in mind throughout the discussions of the foregoing pages—first, that the whole subject of Church Music is no mean subject, to be casually or flippantly dallied with in a light-hearted and superficial spirit, and second,

* It is possible that some further light on what I conceive to be the immense importance of general liturgical knowledge and thoughtfulness among our ministers may be found in my article in the *American Journal of Theology* for October, 1901, on "The Liturgical Responsibilities of Non-Liturgical Churches."

that the care of it and the steady pressure towards the highest ideals in it are responsibilities entrusted most of all to the ministry. It will not rise higher than it stands in the average ministerial estimation, and it will respond most surely and permanently to such stimulus as only the ministry may be disposed to give it.

APPENDICES

APPENDICES

I. Books on Church Music in General, including some biographical and technical works.

Barrett, Wm. A. English Church Composers (prior to about 1870). pp. 7+179. London, 1882. *Low.* $1.00.

Belcher, J. Lectures on the History of Ecclesiastical Music. London, 1872.

Box, Chas. Church Music in the Metropolis [London]. pp. 254. London, 1884. *Reeves.*

Bridge, J. T. Organ Accompaniment. pp. 70. London, 1886. *Novello.* $1.00.

Briggs, H. B. The Elements of Plain Song. 2nd ed., London, 1895. *Quaritch.* $3.50.

Brooks, Henry M. Olden-Time Music [New England]. pp. 20+283. Boston, 1888. *Ticknor.* $1.50.

Buck, Dudley. Illustrations in Choir Accompaniment. pp. 177. N. Y., 1877. *Schirmer.* $3.00.

Butterworth, Hezekiah. The Story of the Tunes. pp. 237. N. Y., 1890. *Am. Tract Soc.* $1.75.

Clarke, Wm. H. Outline of the Structure of the Pipe Organ. pp. 128. Boston, 1877. *Ditson.* $1.50.

Curwen, J. Spencer. Studies in Worship-Music. 1st Series. pp. 8+507. 2nd ed., London, 1888. $2.00. 2nd Series. pp. 6+204. London, 1885. $1.25. *Curwen.*

CURWEN, J. SPENCER. The Boy's Voice. pp. 119. 2nd ed., London, 1894. *Curwen.* $1.00.

DANIEL, R. B. Chapters on Church Music. pp. 12+216. London, 1894. *Stock.* $3.00.

DICKINSON, EDWARD. The History of Church Music. Syllabus with References. pp. 24. Oberlin, 1896.

DICKSON, W. E. Practical Organ Building. pp. 10+182. 2nd ed., London, 1882. *Lockwood.* $1.25.

DOODY, W. H. Hints to Choirs and Choirmasters. pp. 63. London, 1888. *Castle.* 75c.

EDWARDS, C. A. Organs and Organ Building. pp. 248. London, 1881. *"Bazaar" Office.* 5 sh.

EDWARDS, F. G. Common Praise: a Practical Handbook of Nonconformist Church Music. pp. 10+237. London, 1887. *Curwen.* $1.50.

ELLISTON, THOS. Organs and Tuning: a Practical Handbook for Organists. pp. 308. 3rd ed., London, 1898. *Weekes.* $1.50.

ENGEL, CARL. Reflections on Church Music. pp. 110. London, 1856. *Scheurmann.* $1.50.

FARROW, M. The Training of Choir Boys' Voices. pp. 22. N. Y., 1898. *Young.* 50c.

FOWLER, J. T. Life and Letters of John Bacchus Dykes. pp. 14+344. London, 1897. *Murray.* $3.00.

GIRARDEAU, J. L. Instrumental Music in the Church. pp. 208. Columbia, S. C., 1892. *Duffie.* $1.00.

GOULD, NATH. D. History of Church Music in America. pp. 240. Boston, 1853. $4.00.

HABERL, F. X. Magister Choralis [Plain Song]. pp. 8+272. 2nd Eng. ed., N. Y., 1892. *Pustet.* $1.00.

HASTINGS, THOS. Dissertation on Musical Taste. pp. 296. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1853. *Mason.*

HASTINGS, THOS. Sacred Praise. pp. 216. N. Y., 1856. *Barnes.* $1.00.

HELMORE, THOS. Plain Song. pp. 164. London. 1878. *Novello.* $1.00.

HEWINS, J. M. Hints concerning Church Music, the Liturgy, and Kindred Subjects. pp. 180. Boston, 1856. $1.50.

HICKS, E. Church Music. London, 1881. *Heywood.* 1 sh. 6 d.

HINTON, J. W. Organ Construction. pp. 167. 2nd ed., London, 1900. $3.00.

HODGE, CHAS. R. Clergy and Choir. pp. 152. Milwaukee, 1891. *Young Churchman Co.* 75c.

HODGES, FAUSTINA H. Life of Edward Hodges, Organist of Trinity Parish, N. Y., 1839-59. pp. 18+302. N. Y., 1896. *Putnam.* $2.50.

HOOD, GEO. History of Music in New England. pp. 252. Boston, 1846. $6.50.

HOPKINS, E. J., and RIMBAULT, E. F. The Organ: its History and Construction. pp. 31+636. 3rd ed., London, 1877. *Cocks.* $10.00.

HUMPHREYS, FRANK L. The Evolution of Church Music. pp. 179. N. Y., 1896. Scribner. $1.75.

JACOX, FRANCIS. Bible Music [Miscellaneous sketches]. pp. 8+330. 2nd ed., London, 1872. *Hodder & Stoughton.* $2.00.

JOYCE, F. W. Life of Sir F. A. Gore Ouseley. pp. 290. London, 1896. *Methuen.* $3.00.

KNAUFF, CHRISTOPHER W. Dr. Tucker, Priest-Musician [Life of John Ireland Tucker]. pp. 9+351. N. Y., 1897. *Randolph.* $1.50.

KNOWLES, A. Text-Book of Anglican Service Music. pp. 9+55. London, 1895. *Stock.* 75c.

LAWRENCE, ARTHUR. Sir Arthur Sullivan: Life Story, Letters and Reminiscences. pp. 359. Chicago, 1900. *H. B. Stone.* $3.50.

LOCHER, CARL. An Explanation of the Organ Stops. pp. 11+77. London, 1888. *Kegan Paul.* $2.00.

LOVE, JAMES. Scottish Church Music: its Composers and Sources. pp. 7+337. Edinburgh, 1891. *Blackwood.* $3.00.

MALIM, A. W. English Hymn-Tunes. London. *Reeves.* 50c.

MARTIN, GEO. C. The Art of Training Choir Boys. London, 1892. *Novello.* $1.50.

MATHEWS, WM. S. B. A Hundred Years of Music in America. pp. 715. Chicago, 1889. *G. L. Howe.* $5.50.

MATTHEWS, J. Handbook of the Organ. pp. 7+208. London, 1897. *Augener.* $1.00.

MEES, ARTHUR. Choirs and Choral Music. pp. 8+251. N. Y., 1901. *Scribner.* $1.25.

MINSHALL, E. Organs, Organists and Choirs. pp. 74. London, 1886. *Curwen.* 60c.

NICHOLSON, H. D. Organ Manual. Boston. *Ditson.* 75c.

PHELPS, A., PARK, E. A., and FURBER, D. L. Hymns and Choirs. pp. 4+425. Andover, 1860. *Draper.*

RANDALL, M. The Choirmaster's Guide to the Selection of Hymns and Anthems. London. *Novello.* 75c.

RICHARDSON, A. M. Choir Training Based on Voice Production. pp. 5+52. London, 1900. *Novello.* 60c.

RITTER, F. L. Music in America. pp. 14+423. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1890. *Scribner.* $2.00.

ROBERTSON, F. E. Practical Treatise on Organ Building. 2 vols. London, 1897. *Low.* $10.00.

SHEPARDSON, WM. The Organ. pp. 44. London, 1873. *Reeves.* 60c.

SHUTTLEWORTH, HENRY C. The Place of Music in Public Worship. pp. 80. London, 1892. *Stock.* 80c.

SPARK, WM. Henry Smart: his Life and Works. pp. 11+386. London, 1881. *Reeves.* $4.50.

STACY, A. G. The Service of Song. pp. 340. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1874. *Barnes.* $1.25.

STAINER, JOHN. Organ Primer. pp. 102. London, 1877. *Novello.* $1.00.

STAINER, JOHN. The Music of the Bible. pp. 6+186. London, 1879. *Novello.* $2.00.

STEELE, J. N. The Importance of Musical Knowledge to the Priesthood of the Church. pp. 62. N. Y., 1895. *Pott.* 50c.

STUBBS, G. E. Practical Hints on Boy Choir Training. pp. 8+85. N. Y., 1898. *Novello.* 75c.

STUBBS, G. E. How to Sing the Choral Service. pp. 12+110. N. Y., 1899. *Novello.* $1.00.
SUTTON, F. H. Church Organs: their Position and Construction. 3rd ed., London, 1883-4. *Rivington.*
TAUNTON, E. L. The History and Growth of Church Music [R. C.]. pp. 131. London, 1899. *Burns & Oates.* 75c.
TROUTBECK, JOHN. Church Choir Training. pp. 52. London, 1879. *Novello.* 65c.
UPTON, GEO. P. The Standard Oratorios. pp. 335. Chicago, 1887. *McClurg.* $1.50.
UPTON, GEO. P. The Standard Cantatas. pp. 367. Chicago, 1893. *McClurg.* $1.50.
WELSH, R. E. and EDWARDS, F. G. The Romance of Psalter and Hymnal. Authors and Composers. pp. 12+352. N. Y., 1889. *Pott.* $2.40.
WEST, JOHN E. Cathedral Organists, Past and Present. London. *Novello.* $1.50.
WHITLOCK, J. A. Handbook of Bible and Church Music. pp. 134. London, 1898. *S. P. C. K.* $1.00.
WICKS, MARK. Organ Building for Amateurs. pp. 6+287. London, 1887. *Ward & Lock.* $1.50.
WILLEBY, CHAS. The Masters of English Music. pp. 302. N. Y., 1895. *Scribner.* $2.00.
WILLIS, R. S. Our Church Music. pp. 133. N. Y., 1856. $1.75.

The prices of scarce or foreign books in the above list are quoted from the excellent Musical Literature List, issued by Chas. Scribner's Sons, to the compiler of which, Mr. Frank H. Marling, thanks are due for special assistance.

II. Books on Hymns and Hymn-Writers, including a few general collections.

Banks, Louis A. Immortal Hymns and their Story. pp. 8+313. Cleveland, 1898. *Burrows Bros.* $3.00.

Belcher, J. Historical Sketches of Hymns, their Writers and Influence. pp. 415. Phila., 1859. $3.00.

Benson, Louis F. The Best Church Hymns. pp. 32+58. Phila., 1898. *Westminster Press.* 75c.

Biggs, Louis C. English Hymnology. pp. 7+135. London, 1873. *Mozley.* 4 sh.

Burgess, Wm. P. Wesleyan Hymnology. pp. 12+304. 2nd ed., London, 1846. *Snow.*

Burrage, Henry S. Baptist Hymn Writers and their Hymns. pp. 11+682. Portland, Me., 1888. *Thurston.* $1.50.

Butterworth, Hezekiah. The Story of the Hymns. pp. 256. N. Y., 1875. *Am. Tract. Soc.* $1.75.

Buxton, H. J. W. The Lord's Song: Plain Sermons on Hymns. pp. 10+201. London, 1880. *Skeffington.*

C., A. E. Hymns and their Stories. pp. 201. London, 1894. 75c.

Campbell, Duncan. Hymns and Hymn Makers. pp. 195. London, 1898. *Black.* 75c.

Charles, Mrs. E. R. Te Deum Laudamus: Christian Life in Song: the Song and the Singers. pp. 310. 5th ed., London, 1897. S. P. C. K. $1.50.

Christophers, S. W. Hymn-Writers and their Hymns. pp. 378. 3rd ed., London, 1898. *Partridge.* $1.50.

CHRISTOPHERS, S. W. The New Methodist Hymn Book and its Writers. pp. 287. London, 1877. *Hodder & Stoughton.* $1.50.

CHURCH CLUB OF NEW YORK. Lauda Sion: or the Liturgical Hymns of the Church. [Lectures by various writers.] pp. 2+195. N. Y., 1896. *Young.* 50c.

CREAMER, DANIEL. Methodist Hymnology. pp. 470. N. Y., 1848. $1.75.

DORRICOTT, I., and COLLINS, T. Lyric Studies: a Hymnal Guide. pp. 8+328. London. *Toulson.*

DUFFIELD, SAMUEL W. English Hymns: their Authors and History. pp. 7+675. N. Y., 1886. *Funk.* $3.00.

DUFFIELD, SAMUEL W. The Latin Hymn-Writers and their Hymns. pp. 11+511. N. Y., 1889. *Funk.* $3.00.

ELLERTON, JOHN. Writings on Hymnology [with Life of the Author]. N. Y. *Young.* $2.00.

GAISFORD, FRANCES. Hymns and their Associations. pp. 91. London, 1889. *Stock.* 75c.

GLASS, HENRY A. The Story of the Psalters. pp. 7+208. London, 1888. *Kegan Paul.*

HATFIELD, EDWIN F. The Poets of the Church. pp. 719. N. Y., 1884. *Randolph.* $3.00.

HEATON, Jos. Two Lectures on the Wesleyan Hymn-Book. pp. 68. London, 1862. *Mason.*

HEMENWAY, F. D., and STUART, CHAS. M. Gospel Singers and their Songs. pp. 195. N. Y., 1891. *Hunt & Eaton.* $1.00.

HOLLAND, JOHN. The Psalmists of Britain. 2 vols. London. 1843.

HORDER, W. GARRETT. The Hymn-Lover: an Account of the Rise and Growth of English Hymnody. pp. 14+526. London, 1889. *Curwen.* $1.75.

HORDER, W. GARRETT. The Treasury of American Sacred Song. pp. 10+387. London, 1896. *Frowde.* $1.50.

HUTCHINS, C. L. Annotations of the Hymnal. pp. 206. Hartford, 1872.

Hyde, T. D. Hymnal Sermon Pictures. pp. 351. London, 1893. *Dickinson.* $1.75.

Jones, Wm. B. Topical Index [to Hymns, Bible-Readings, etc.] Albany, 1891. Brandow. $1.00.

Julian, John J. Dictionary of Hymnology. pp. 12+1616. N. Y., 1892. *Scribner.* $10.00.

King, James. Anglican Hymnology. pp. 19+321. N. Y., 1886. *Pott.* $2.00.

Kubler, Theo. Historical Notes to the *Lyra Germanica.* pp. 16+356. London, 1865. *Longmans.*

Leonard, H. C. The Sacred Songs of the World [translated from 170 languages]. pp. 223. London, 1899. *Stock.* $3.00.

Lewis, H. E. The Sweet Singers of Wales. pp. 6+160. London, 1889. *Religious Tract Soc.* $1.00.

Macdonald, F. Latin Hymns in the Wesleyan Hymn-Book. $1.00.

Miller, Josiah. Singers and Songs of the Church. pp. 18+617. 2nd ed., London. 1869. *Longmans.* $5.00.

Moorsome, Robt. M. Historical Companion to *Hymns Ancient and Modern.* pp. 23+383. London, 1889. *Parker.*

Morrison, Duncan. The Great Hymns of the Church. pp. 23+250. London, 1890. *Simpkin.* $1.50.

Nutter, Chas. S. Hymn-Studies. pp. 475. N. Y., 1884. *Phillips & Hunt.* $2.25.

Nutter, Chas. S. Historic Hymnists. pp. 208. Boston, 1893. $2.50.

Palgrave, F. T. The Treasury of Sacred Song. pp. 9+374. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1890. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

Parker, Wm. H. The Psalmody of the Church. pp. 10+242. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1892. *Revell.* $1.50.

Pitman, Mrs. E. R. Lady Hymn-Writers. pp. 369. London, 1892. *Nelson.* $2.00.

Prescott, J. E. Christian Hymns and Hymn-Writers. pp. 228. London, 1883. *Bell.* $2.40.

PUTNAM, A. P. Singers and Songs of the Liberal Faith. pp. 23+556. Boston, 1875. *Roberts.*

ROBINSON, CHAS. S. Annotations upon Popular Hymns. pp. 581. N. Y., 1893. *Hunt & Eaton.* $2.50.

SAUNDERS, FREDERICK. Evenings with the Sacred Poets. pp. 574. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1885. *Randolph.* $2.50.

SCHAFF, PHILIP, and GILMAN, ARTHUR. Library of Religious Poetry. pp. 31+1004. 2nd ed., N. Y., 1895. *Funk.* $6.00.

SCHAFF, PHILIP. Christ in Song: Hymns of Immanuel. pp. 24+711. N. Y., 1868. *Randolph.*

SELBORNE, EARL OF [Roundell Palmer]. Hymns: their History and Development. pp. 216. London, 1892. *Black.* $1.25.

SMITH, MRS. E. M. Woman in Sacred Song. pp. 26+883. Boston, 1885. *Lothrop.* $3.50.

STEAD, WM. T. Hymns that have Helped. p. 276. London, 1896. *Review of Reviews.* 75c.

STEVENSON, G. J. The Methodist Hymn-Book Illustrated. pp. 636. London, 1883. *Partridge.*

TILLETT, W. F. Our Hymns and their Authors. pp. 439. Nashville, Tenn., 1889. *So. Meth. Pub. House.* $2.00.

WELSH, R. E., and EDWARDS, F. G. The Romance of Psalter and Hymnal: Authors and Composers. pp. 12+352. N. Y., 1889. *Pott.* $2.40.

WINKWORTH, CATHARINE. The Christian Singers of Germany. pp. 13+340. London, 1869. *Macmillan.* $1.50.

See note at end of Appendix I.

III. American Church Hymnals published since 1880, arranged in order of date.

The Evangelical Hymnal. 610 hymns, 572 tunes. Edited by Chas. Cuthbert Hall and Sigismund Lasar. N. Y., 1880. *Barnes.*

Songs of Christian Praise. 660 hymns, 415 tunes. Edited by Chas. H. Richards. N. Y., 1880. *Taintor Bros.*

The Book of Worship, with tunes [Lutheran]. 601 hymns, 357 tunes. Phila., 1880. *Luth. Publ. Soc.*

Worship in Song. 712 hymns, 383 tunes. Edited by Jos. P. Holbrook. N. Y., 1880. *Barnes.*

The Church Praise Book. 727 hymns, 400 tunes. Edited by M. Woolsey Stryker and Hubert P. Main. N. Y., 1881. *Biglow & Main.*

The Hymnal [Prot. Episc.] 532 hymns, 501 tunes. Edited by A. B. Goodrich and Walter B. Gilbert. N. Y., 1882. *Dutton.*

The Methodist Hymnal, with tunes. 1117 hymns, 403+13 tunes. N. Y., 1882. *Phillips & Hunt.*

The Evangelical [Association's] Hymn and Tune Book. 875 hymns. Cleveland, 1882.

The New Christian Hymn and Tune Book. 710 hymns, 384 tunes. Edited by Jas. H. Fillmore. Cincinnati, 1882. *Fillmore Bros.*

The Church Book. 522 hymns, 313 tunes. Edited by Leonard W. Bacon. N. Y., 1883. *Appleton.*

The Baptist Hymnal. 704 hymns, 534 tunes. Edited by W. H. Doane and E. H. Johnson. Phila., 1883. *Am. Bapt. Pub. Soc.*

LAUDES DOMINI. 1168 hymns, 647 tunes. Edited by Chas. S. Robinson. N. Y., 1884. *Century Co.*

CARMINA SANCTORUM. 746 hymns, 452 tunes. Edited by Roswell D. Hitchcock, Zachary Eddy and L. W. Mudge. N. Y., 1885. *Barnes.*

THE BOOK OF COMMON PRAISE [Reformed Episc.] 544 hymns, 691 tunes. Edited by Jas. A. Moore and W. W. Gilchrist. Phila., 1886. *Hoffman.*

SONGS OF PILGRIMAGE. 1533 hymns, 350 tunes. Edited by H. L. Hastings. Boston, 1886.

HYMN AND TUNE BOOK [Primitive Bapt.] 627 hymns, 253 tunes. Edited by S. H. Durand and P. G. Lester. Greenfield, Ind., 1886. *Goble.*

HYMNS OF THE FAITH. 629 hymns, 430 tunes. Edited by George Harris, W. J. Tucker and E. K. Glezen. Boston, 1887. *Houghton, Mifflin.*

CHURCH SONG. 683 hymns, 455 tunes. Edited by M. Woolsey Stryker. N. Y., 1889. *Biglow & Main.*

THE CHURCH HYMNARY. 994 hymns, 818 tunes. Edited by Edwin A. Bedell. N. Y., 1890. *Taintor Bros.*

THE HYMNAL [Reformed]. 760 hymns. Cleveland, 1890.

OFFICES OF WORSHIP AND HYMNS, with tunes [Moravian]. 1516 hymns. Bethlehem, Pa., 1891.

THE NEW LAUDES DOMINI. 1216 hymns, 673 tunes. Edited by Chas. S. Robinson. N. Y., 1892. *Century Co.*

THE PLYMOUTH HYMNAL. 638 hymns, 492 tunes. Edited by Lyman Abbott, Chas. H. Morse and H. V. Abbott. N. Y., 1893. *"Outlook" Co.*

THE NATIONAL HYMN BOOK. 156 hymns, 151 tunes. Edited by Robert E. Thompson. Phila., 1893. *Wattles.* [Made up only of

hymns and tunes found in most of the current American hymnals.]

THE HYMNAL, Revised [Prot. Episc.] 679 hymns, 644 tunes. Edited by A. H. Messiter. N. Y., 1893. *Young.*

THE HYMNAL, Revised [Prot. Episc.] 679 hymns, 746 tunes. Edited by J. Ireland Tucker and W. W. Rousseau. N. Y., 1894. *Century Co.*

THE HYMNAL, Revised [Prot. Episc.] 679 hymns, tunes. Edited by Chas. L. Hutchins. 1895.

THE HYMNAL. [Presbyterian] 724 hymns, 646 tunes. Edited by Louis F. Benson. Phila., 1895. *Pres. Board of Publ.* Also: Boston. *Cong. S. S. & Publ. Soc.*

CHURCH HARMONIES, NEW AND OLD [Universalist]. Edited by Chas. R. Tenney and L. R. Lewis. Boston, 1895. *Universalist Publ. Soc.*

THE HYMNAL. Revised [Prot. Episc.] 679 hymns. Edited by Jas. H. Darlington. N. Y., 1897. *Whittaker.*

IN EXCELSIS. 861 hymns, 861+39 tunes. N. Y., 1897. *Century Co.*

SURSUM CORDA [Baptist]. 856 hymns, 988 tunes. Edited by E. H. Johnson and E. E. Ayres. Phila., 1898. *Am. Bapt. Publ. Soc.*

THE HYMNAL OF THE [German] EVANGELICAL CHURCH. 888 hymns, 690 tunes. St. Louis, 1899. *Eden Publ. House.*

INDEX

INDEX

American church music, 83–85, 89–90, 108, 117–119, 135–136, 139.
Anthems, the fixed canticles of the historic liturgies, 94–97; their ideality, 95–97.
Anthems as "opening pieces," 97–98.
Anthems, "expressive:" prayer and praise, 92–100.
Anthems, "impressive:" instruction and uplift, 100–109.
Anthems, classification of texts, 109–112.
Anthems, their practical selection and rehearsal, 141–143.

Bach, J. S., 22, 24–25.
Barnby, Joseph, 51.
Benedictus, the, 94.
Bennett, W. Sterndale, 103–104.
Boy choirs, 84.

Calvin, John, 19.
Cantatas, 114–115.
Canticles, the regular, 94–95.
Cathedral services, 32–34.
Children's aptitude for hymnody, 77.
Choir, the, in Mediæval church music, 86–87; at the Reformation, 87–88.
Choir, the, its necessity in church music, 85–86; the intricacy of its problem, 83–86.
Choir, the, its form, 84, 91, 140–141; the quartette 99, 108–109.
Choir, the, and the minister, 147–151.
Choirmasters often distinct from organists, 134–135.
Choirmasters, their duties, 140–143.
Choir music in America, 83–85, 89; in Germany and England, 87–88.
Choir music, its three functions, 90–116; in the second service, 112–116.
Choir music, its practical selection and rehearsal, 141–143.
Choir rehearsals, 142, 150.
Choir singers, their responsibility, 90-92, 98-100, 108–109.
Choir singers, their church membership, 117–119; general fitness, 119.
Choir singers, deserve sympathy and honor, 120–121.
Chorales, their historic importance, 18–20, 23, 54, 62.
Chorus choir, the, 84, 91, 140-141.
Church music, *see* Music in Public Worship.
Composition, influenced by church music, 14–27.
Concertistic style, the, 99-100, 109.
Congregational music, *see* Hymn-singing.
Counterpoint, 15–25, 86.
Cowper, William, 51.

Des Prés, 17.
Doxology, the, 77.
Dufay, 17.
Duffield, S. W., quoted, 53.
Dykes, J. B., 51, 62.

Ellerton, John, 51.
English Church, the, 32, 87–88.
English church music, 26, 51, 62, 84, 87–88.

English hymnody, 54.
"Expressive" anthems, 92–100.

Form, musical, 15, 18–19.

Gauntlett, H. J., 51.
German church music, *see* Luther and Lutheran music.
"Gospel Hymns," the, 59–65.
Greek hymnody, 53.
Gregorian style, the, 16, 18, 20, 54.

Handel, G. F., 22, 24.
Harmony, 15, 19, 157.
Hebrew music, 11, 28–29.
How, W. W., 51.
Hymn-books, their editing a special art, 55–56.
Hymn-books, good and bad, 56–57, 64; "the Gospel Hymns," 59–65.
Hymnody, developed by music, 28–31; in the Reformation, 46–48; in Scotland, 66; among Methodists, 66.
Hymnody, its ideality, 39, 49–50; its personal values, 67–71.
Hymnody, its vast extent, 52–54; its use fixed by hymn books, 55–56.
Hymnody, its systematic study, 73–76, 151, 159–160.
Hymn-singing at the Reformation, 18–20, 46–48; central in Protestant church music, 51–52, 81–82.
Hymn-singing, its three great purposes, 57–71; its expressive aspect important, 77–78.
Hymn-singing, its practicality, 48–49, 81–82; dependent on hymn-books, 56–57, on tune playing, 79–81, on choir leadership, 90–92.
Hymn-singing, often heedless and mechanical, 72–73.
Hymn-singing, best improved by attention to the words, 76–77.

"Impressive" anthems, 100–109.
Instrumental music, 21, 41–43, 125–132.
Interludes, 124, 131–132.

Julian, John, quoted, 54.

Lanier, Sidney, quoted, 40.
Lassus, 17.
Latin hymnody, 53.
Luther's musical ideas, 19, 46–47, 87.
Lutheran music, 32, 87–88.

Mediæval music, 11, 14–18, 816, 22.
Mendelssohn, Felix, 25.
Methodist hymnody, 66.
Ministers and church music in general, 146–147; and hymnody, 72–73, 76–78; and choir music, 83, 98, 113–116; and organ music, 129–131.
Ministers and musical officials, 136–137, 147–151.
Ministers and the conduct of musical exercises, 152–154.
Ministers and the musical education of congregations, 151–154.
Ministers, their duty of musical self-education, 154–162.
Monk, W. H., 62.
Montgomery, James, 51.
Music, in the form of song, 37–41; instrumental, 41–44, 125–126.
Music, its moral and spiritual values, 35–44.
Music, its intimate connection with religion, 10–35.
Music in Theological Seminaries, 155–162.
Music in public worship, its magnitude and value, 11–12, 161–162; dependent on the organist, 133–134, on popular standards, 138, on the minister, 146–162.
Music in public worship, its systematic study, 151–162.

Newton, John, 61.

Okeghem, 17.
"Opening pieces," 97-98.
Opera, the, 25–26.
Oratorio, the, 25–26, 157.
Organ, the, its origin, early use and influence, 20–25, 122.
Organ-building, 21, 122–124.
Organists, their functions in general, 123–124.
Organists, their appointment, 135-136; character and equipment, 137–139; relation to the pastor, 136–137, 149–150, to the congregation, 143–145.
Organists, women often fitted for, 139–140.
Organists and hymn-singing, 78–81; and the choir, 134–135, 140–143; and preludes, 128–129.
Organ music in general, 124–132; preludes, 126–131; postludes, 130; interludes, 131–132; recitals, 81, 144.

Palestrina, 17, 23, 24.
Palmer, Ray, 51.
Postludes, 124, 130.
Prayer-meetings, music in, 56, 70, 73, 77, 81, 143.
Precentors, 91.
Preludes, 124, 126–130.
Protestantism, its musical influence, 19–20, 23, 45–48, 87, 89–90.
Psalms, the, 11, 28–31, 53, 66.
Public Worship, Protestant and Roman Catholic systems of, 45–48.
Public Worship, its relations to music, 10–12, 27–35.
Public Worship, its systematic study, 159-161.

Quakers, the, 11.
Quartette, the, 91, 99, 108-109, 118–119, 140.

Reformation, the, 11, 19, 46–47, 87.
Religion, its two senses, 9; its institutionality, 13.
Religion, its relation to music, 14–35.
Ritual, its power largely dependent on music, 11, 31–32.
Roman Catholic music, 22–23, 24, 87, 137.

Schaff, Philip, quoted, 53
Scottish Version, the, 66,
Secular music, 18, 26.
Service, the second, music in, 73, 113–116.
Singing, a special art, 37–41. 156.
Singing, its impressive power, 105–106, 108–109.
Singing classes, 76, 144.
Solo singing, 91, 108–109.
Stainer, John, quoted, 51, 102–103.
Sullivan, Arthur, 51, 62, 81.
Sunday-school, the, music in, 56, 72, 74-75, 77, 81, 143–144.

Te Deum, the, 94, 97.
Theological Seminaries, music in, 155–162.
Tunes, their artistic value, 50–51; ignorance of, 62–63.
Tunes, their treatment by organists, 79–81.
Tune-writing, its vast extent, 54–55; the English school of, 51, 62.

Voice-training for ministers, 155–156.
Voluntaries, *see* Preludes.

Wagner, Richard, 26.
Watts, Isaac, 66.
Wesley, Charles, 51, 66.
Women as organists, 139–140.

Young People's Societies and music, 75–76.

DATE DUE

Demco, Inc. 38-293

Main ML3000.P91
Pratt, Waldo Selden.
CINCINNATI CHRISTIAN UNIVERSITY LIBRARY
3 4320 00209 6628
DENISON UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES

264.2 P889 1901
Pratt, Waldo Selden,
1857-1939.
Musical ministries in the
church